THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. III, NO. 16 NEW YORK, MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1944 NUMBER 1559

Reminder

If you don't register, you can't vote. If you don't vote, you have no right to complain if the trusteeship of the nation is placed in the hands of undesirable men for undesirable ends. If there is still time in your state, and you have not already done so, we urge you: register and vote.

The Problem Before the Allies

The Germans have succeeded to a remarkable degree in their effort to hold the vital gateways leading to their sanctum sanctorum, the "holy soil" of the Reich itself. When the armies of the Western Allies were romping across France, or when those of the Soviet Union were slashing across White Russia, the gates to Germany appeared to be open and virtually undefended. If the Allied armies had been able to maintain the pace of their offensive—a condition impossible of fulfilment, because inevitably they outran their supplies—they might have made an easy and deep penetration into Germany. But the Germans regrouped in the nick of time, and their stiffened resistance, coupled with the supply difficulties of the Allies and the onset of a new kind of Hitler weather, made it possible for them to slam shut the gates.

In consequence, the United States (and more especially those of them which are coöperating closely in the west) have been faced with a major decision: Shall they continue to drive in for a quick kill, knowing full well that no more than a month of passably good fighting weather remains in Western Europe? Or shall they, while maintaining the usual pressure of course, make their plans on the expectation that a major penetration of the Reich will be impossible until springtime? The conclusion is inescapable that this crucial problem was what took General Marshall, United States Army Chief of Staff, and James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, to France for conferences with General Eisenhower and his subordinate commanders.

German Guerrillas

Not content with their successful holding operations along their borders, the Nazis have laid plans for a continuation of hostilities after the Allied armies have passed. This is an outstanding example of the bitten seeking to become the biter. In every country where the Germans have had armies of occupation, they have been confronted with the restless ingenuity and inventiveness of peoples who refused to concede defeat. The Germans, and especially the Gestapo, SS and SA elements, must have accumulated a vast lore dealing with resistance and guerrilla tactics. And there is every reason to believe that intransigent elements in the Reich will continue the struggle after the disciplined legions of the Wehrmacht have laid down their arms.

But there is good reason to question how effective this resistance can be. If armed bands seek to hold out in the Black Forest or Silesia, they will be at a grave disadvantage when compared even with the Yugoslav Partisans or the French Marquisards of recent years. For they will have no outside sources of supply: there will be no RAF or Red Air Force to parachute supplies to them. Their elimination will be difficult, but by no means impossible. Those who make a stand in the cities, waging a literally underground warfare from cellar to cellar and concentrating to a great extent upon

CONTENTS

The Week 475

Editorials

Wendell Willkie 479
Lying to Get Elected 479

General Articles

A Rich Man's Tax Program . . . Oscar Gass 481
France Plans Her Future . . Maurice Edelman 484
The Next Congress: II . . James Loeb Jr. 487
Henry J. Taylor: Soft-Spoken Pegler . Potomacus 490
The Negro Press and Politics . Harry McAlpin 493
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 494
More Notes on Newsreels . . Manny Farber 495
The Bandwagon 495

Correspondence 496

Books in Review

The France That Died . . . Varian Fry 497
Four Portraits of Roosevelt . Allan Spalding 498
Who Has Rescued Whom . . Marianne Moore 499
Africa Speaks—for Itself . . . . . Melville J. Herskovits 500
A Reader's List 501
Crime and Punishment . . . . . E. H. 502

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1944, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sabotage rather than drawn battles, will pose a similar but not insuperable problem.

Why Do They Advertise?

Of more interest, perhaps, than the Germans' chances of success in this type of resistance is their motive for giving wide publicity to their plans. It is superficially illogical, to say the least, to organize such a movement through the columns of the Völkischer Beobachter. But the German propaganda directors well know that the free press of the Western Allies will avidly reprint their mouthings on this subject. In this fact they have a far from secret, but none the less potent, weapon. The more attention the press and peoples of the United Nations give to this prospect of indefinite prolongation of the war, the greater will be the Nazis' hopes that war-weariness will set in. The winter is as fertile a time for this type of disease as it is for the common cold. If the Germans can simultaneously force a continuation of West Wall fighting through the winter and set the United Nations to worrying about what will happen after this, they can continue to hope for a division among their enemies which may soften the terms of the peace to be imposed upon them.

In other words, the Nazi specialists in "popular enlightenment" are busy creating a new myth of German invincibility.

Politics in the Balkans

On the face of things, recent events in Southern Europe would seem to give the Germans little hope that the United Nations will relent in their determination to hunt down the last German soldier or agent outside the Reich's borders. They are being pursued through the isles of Greece, through the "diagonal trough" of the Balkan valleys, through the forbidding mountains of Epirus, Albania and Serbia, to the plains of Hungary. But to what end? If it be true, as Prime Minister Churchill has asserted, that the war is becoming less and less ideological, it certainly is not true that it is becoming any less political.

A glance at the map will show that if the Russians, having succeeded in knocking Rumania out of the war, had concentrated their southern armies at the Carpathian passes leading to Slovakia, they would have had a far more direct route to the historic battleground of Hungary than that which leads first down to the Danube, then up its valley for interminable miles.

A Long Row to Hoe

Of the several routes leading to Germany, that which lies through the Balkans is the longest and the most punishing for invading armies. The Russians have made a wide swing around the Carpathians and the Transylvanian Alps to reach the plains of Hungary by way of the Daunbe Basin. The British campaign through Greece is even more remote. And expert Nazi resistance in Italy has delayed a break across the Po River toward the Austrian passes.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are sound military reasons for using the more roundabout route, no doubt, but even military reasons are not inflexible forces. The Russian drive into Bulgaria and Yugoslavia was the resultant of military and political forces.

Why Britain Invaded Greece

Similarly, and perhaps to a still greater extent, the British operations in Greece and Albania represent an elaborate locking of the stable door after the horse has run away. The British forces used in these enterprises, while admittedly small, could have been used with greater military effect farther north—closer to Germany. But the political effects might not have been so desirable. Indeed, it is widely believed that Churchill has strongly advocated an offensive on a large scale into the Balkans, meaning Yugoslavia, and has been prevented from launching it by American military opposition and Russian political opposition.

Even in Italy, a like phenomenon is to be observed. Field Marshal Kesserling's 25 divisions have been engaging a greatly superior Allied force. But the Allied force need not have been so overwhelming if it had not been committed to a continuous offensive. Many Allied divisions could have been withdrawn, after the politically necessary liberation of Rome, or at any time since then, and could have been employed with possibly greater military profit elsewhere.

As matters stand now, the British are secure in their politico-military domination of the lifeline to Suez, the Russians have greater influence than ever before in the Balkans, and the rest of the United Nations can congratulate themselves on the fact that no open clash of interests has developed. But it will require a high degree of statesmanship to maintain that record as the various Allied armies deploy on adjoining sectors for the final battles on German soil.

Greece for the Greeks

The invasion of Greece would seem to indicate that Greece is to be within the British Mediterranean sphere of influence. Are the British coming as liberators? Or are they coming to restore King George? In a dispatch to The New York Times of October 9, 1944, Milton Bracker reports from Rome that "the greatest headache of the British commander-in-chief . . . was not German resistance but fear that the ELAS-EAM men would pour out of the mountains and massacre the members of the Greek 'security battalions' as the Germans withdrew." In other words, the British are intent upon preventing, if possible, the liberation of Greece by the Greeks themselves. The Greek Liberation Movement is violently opposed to the restoration of King George, whose prewar fascist policies have not been forgotten. Although the King himself has promised to abide by the decision of a popular plebiscite on the question of monarchy, the British seem unwilling to abandon him.

Mr. Roosevelt's Second Speech

The President's talk to the party workers was a rather humdrum affair compared with his witty attack on the opposition in the speech to the Teamsters' Union. The fact that he spent a good part of it specifically denying that he had any sympathy with the Communists' program for the United States is evidence of the low level to which the Republican politicians have dragged the campaign. As we point out elsewhere, they are doing their best to appear, not as alternatives to the foreign and domestic programs of the administration, but as saviors of the Republic from the Red Menace. Their next best argument is the obviously phony charge that the Democrats will prevent the soldiers from coming home because they are afraid of unemployment, and this, too, the President forcefully countered. It is true, as Mr. Roosevelt said, that the technique of arousing fears of the Reds is the preferred propaganda method of Hitler and Goebbels. It is also true, as he did not say, that the Nazis learned this technique from reactionary politicians in Britain and the United States. Decades of experience with it should have taught American voters by this time that those who use it invariably wish to conceal from the eyes of the voters their own anti-democratic tendencies. Employment of this device should be sufficient to mark for defeat any aspirant for office.

Dewey on Taxes

In his speech on federal taxation, Mr. Dewey ran true to form. You can always get votes by promising to reduce taxes; therefore this was an obvious line to take. But what exactly should be said on the subject? On this, as on all other important issues, Mr. Dewey never had any ideas of his own and had no original program to offer. It is perfectly clear that his research staff took the CED plan, the Twin Cities plan, the Ruml-Sonne plan, and evolved out of them a series of generalities which obscured their critical differences and would leave the way open for any specific measure which might in the future seem expedient. This mixture was then served up in such a way as to appear critical of the administration on the ground of having had the wrong tax program in the past. The hearer was also allowed to infer that taxes would be reduced as soon as Mr. Dewey took office, regardless of war necessities. There is no assurance whatever that when the proper time comes, the administration will not have an equally good program. But the speech plugged a hole in the campaign strategy.

Opinions of the Candidates

We quote below comments on President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey, by a well known syndicated newspaper columnist. Of Mr. Roosevelt, he says: "The one man who is responsible for the vast improve-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of the military fitness of the United States, achieved from a standing start after the invasion of the Low Countries, never for an instant faltered in his determination to get the American nation in shape to meet the inevitable. . . . He was right all along and doggedly brave in times when he fought almost alone to make the people recognize their enemies and prepare to fight, and the final proof of his wise courage was given by the enemy himself. . . ."

Of Governor Dewey, this columnist says: "I agree that as a presidential possibility Dewey is preposterous and that his election would be a calamity, which happily does not seem imminent. He just isn't man enough for the job of President."

The author of both these statements is Westbrook Pegler. The first appeared December 9, 1941, and the other on June 17, 1940.

The Happy Warrior

Probably no candidate for President within the memory of living Americans was regarded with more personal affection than Al Smith. From Tammany Hall, in which he received his early political education, he failed to learn fraud or corruption; what he did learn was that politics can be an instrument to care for needs of ordinary men and women. His millions of supporters had confidence that he served their interests, not just to get elected, but because his heart was with them. As Governor of New York he made an unequaled record for progressive labor and social legislation, and for honest and efficient administration. He never muddied the political waters with phony issues or smear campaigns, but adopted coherent programs of specific measures, which he made popular by vivid factual exposition. Practical common sense combined with a liberal attitude gave him, in his way, some of the quality of Lincoln. No one who ever heard him speak can forget the way he brought arguments down to earth when he began in his husky voice: "Now let's look at the record."

The sidewalks of New York spoke too vividly in the brown derby, the ever present cigar, the accent, the fact that he was a Catholic and a wet, to make him a candidate easily acceptable to the rest of the country. But his main handicap in the contest with the Great Engineer was the immense prestige of the Republican Party as the symbol of long years of expanding prosperity. It did not sound absurd at the time to the great majority of voters when Roger Babson, dean of the Wall Street tipsters, said, "If Smith should be elected with a Democratic Congress, we are almost certain to have a resulting business depression in 1929."

Later it was said that Al Smith was lucky not to have been overwhelmed by the flood of events which sank Herbert Hoover. But he ceased to be the Happy Warrior when he could no longer hold public office. Frustrated by the lack of opportunity to do the kind of job which he knew so well how to perform, he aged and lost his touch with the aspirations of the people. It is in some ways a pity that he never had the opportunity which later came to the man who was both his protégé and sponsor, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Anti-Roosevelt Front

While the Dies Committee has been bringing shame to the Congress with its sham investigation of the National Citizens' Political Action Committee, the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures, under the chairmanship of Representative Clinton Anderson of New Mexico, has proceeded with a thorough and courageous investigation of the multitude of anti-administration organizations which pose as "educational," "non-political" groups. At the start, Frank Gannett and Joe Kamp flatly refused to open the books of their Committee for Constitutional Government and Constitutional Education League for inspection. Representative Anderson promptly brought contempt proceedings and moved on to an investigation of Gerald L. K. Smith and the American Democratic National Committee, a new front formed to help steal the Southern electoral vote. Gerald Smith for the first time admitted what most people who know Detroit had always believed—that a Ford representative has put up cash for his dubious activities. The finances of the American Democratic group remain to be exposed, but its chairman, Gleason Archer, gave enough information about interlockings between this committee and other Republican-inspired outfits to make the picture entirely clear.

It has just been brought to our attention, by the way, that there was an erroneous statement regarding Representative Anderson in our supplement, "A Congress to Win the War and the Peace," published with our issue of May 8. We incorrectly recorded Representative Anderson as voting the wrong way on the anti-poll-tax bill. So far as we know, this was the only error out of 9,558 tabulations in our chart. Our apologies to Representative Anderson; the error will of course be corrected in all future editions of the supplement.

Aid for Education

There are few more important postwar matters in this country than the provision of federal aid for education. Yet the national conference on rural education which has been meeting in Washington received almost no attention from the press until Fala did a few extemporaneous nip-ups before the group. The Thomas bill providing federal assistance to needy school districts, after passing the Senate last year, died unsung in the House Committee on Education, stacked against it. The educators who took part in the recent rural-education conference have shouted the grim facts of their predicament from every platform and through every medium they could crash. They have told us of average salaries still under $1,000 per year, many as low as $300 per year, of thousands of rural schools

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

closed down entirely and of thousands of others limping along with emergency teachers not good enough for the jobs. But the country paid no attention.

The President's speech to the conference again spotlights this critical question. Never again, the President said, can we allow 40 percent of our young men to fall below minimum reasonable standards of education and health, as this wartime draft has revealed the present generation to be. Fine talk about educational opportunities for returning servicemen and a better world for all will continue to fall flat until Congress is forced to put aside the flimsy excuse of "states' rights" and vote for the only possible answer—federal aid for education.

Wendell Willkie

THE UNEXPECTED DEATH of Wendell Willkie is a heavy blow to American liberalism. Four years ago, few liberals would have dreamed that the day would ever come when such a sentence could be written with truth. Four years ago Mr. Willkie had only one thing in common with American liberals: his concern for the civil liberties of the individual. But few people in all our history can have grown as much as Mr. Willkie did during the four years following his defeat. His trip around the world opened his eyes to problems of whose existence he had previously hardly been aware; and writing his book, "One World," served to clarify and solidify his views. To be sure, it is always easier to speak freely if you are an independent critic than it is when you fill an important governmental position; but even making allowance for this fact, it remains true that at the time of his death Willkie was probably the clearest and strongest single voice in the country in favor of internationalism on a high level and the extension of civil rights to Negroes and other oppressed American minorities. And even in domestic economic reform he was at least willing to go as fast as the country as a whole, or perhaps a little faster. The liberalism and incisiveness of his views served to underline the difference between his position and that of Dewey, the cautious reader of the Gallup Poll, who has no views on any subject until he is forced to take a stand and then remains as timid and equivocal as he can.

Mr. Willkie was deeply wounded by the gratuitous insult paid him by the Republican Party—at the direct instigation, we are reliably informed, of Mr. Dewey—in that he was not even invited to the Chicago convention of the party whose standard-bearer he had been only four years ago. He labored heroically to persuade the Republicans to write a liberal platform, but in vain. At the time of his death it was an open secret that he did not intend to lift a finger to further Dewey's candidacy. Now that he is gone, we do not doubt that many thousands of persons among his followers, in whom he inspired such passionate loyalty, will take a peculiar satisfaction in voting this autumn against the Republican who so needlessly slighted their hero. Wendell Willkie was a man in a high American tradition who found it possible in middle life to rise above the ties of environment, friendship, tradition and inertia, and to grow mightily, even before the eyes of his fellow countrymen. We can ill afford such a loss.

Lying to Get Elected

THE Republican presidential campaign is rapidly degenerating into an orgy of falsehood. The party strategists have evidently decided that they have little hope of defeating Mr. Roosevelt in a fair contest and they are therefore seeing what they can do with an unfair one.

Mr. Dewey continues to repeat his completely untrue accusation that the administration intends to delay demobilization of soldiers after the war. He continues to call it the Roosevelt depression, although it had gone on for three and one-half years before Mr. Roosevelt took office. Now he has added the new charge that the Roosevelt administration is headed toward a "corporate state," although there is no evidence to support such a charge. Mr. Dewey professes to be alarmed because 55 government agencies have combined resources of $27 billion, and the United States owns one-fifth of our factories. Assuming his figures to be correct—we haven't checked them—it is shocking to learn that Mr. Dewey

Fitzpatrick in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Time Bomb in Hitler's Fortress

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has never heard of the war, which brought these conditions about. If Mr. Roosevelt is ambitious to change our form of government, it is curious that in 12 years he has made not the slightest move in this direction. Private enterprise was never more flourishing than it is today; profits were never bigger. Luxury spending, limited only by wartime scarcity, was never more lavish. Long-time readers of The New Republic know that in our opinion, instead of having gone too far, Mr. Roosevelt never went so far as he should toward restricting greedy private enterprise.

As for the Communists, they support Mr. Roosevelt, not because they really agree with him, but because we are fighting in this war on the side of Russia. Up to the very day when Hitler attacked the USSR, they were denouncing Mr. Roosevelt furiously and were sabotaging the war effort. The Communists are a nuisance, whose support is embarrassing, but it is prefectly ridiculous to say that they are a serious menace in the United States or that they could ever take over the Democratic Party or the government. At most, they constitute, including party members and fellow travelers, perhaps 200,000 people in a nation of almost 140 millions, with 80 million voters.

Nevertheless, the wild-eyed campaign to smear the New Deal, and especially the National Citizens' PAC, as Communist, goes merrily on. The Hearst and Scripps-Howard papers, now almost indistinguishable in their hysterical witch-hunting, are screaming at the top of their voices. From the moribund Dies Committee we have had what someone has called "the swan song of a lame duck," endeavoring to show that a large number of well known people, members of the NCPAC, had ever so many "Communist affiliations." Intelligent people long ago ceased to pay any attention to the mud-slinging by this committee, but, for its historical interest, a few words about the attack may be worth while. Among those who are now accused of being Communists or Communist collaborators are:

Former Governor Pinchot of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. Pinchot; Dr. William A. Neilson, former president of Smith College; Bishop Francis McConnell; Dr. Francis McMahon, distinguished Catholic layman, now at the University of Chicago; Jennings Perry, editor of The Nashville Tennessean; Dr. Arthur M. Schlesinger of Harvard University; two of the editors of The New Republic; James Loeb Jr. of the Union for Democratic Action; the editor of The Nation; Dr. Will Alexander, one of Georgia's most distinguished citizens; and others equally well known and equally far from communism.

Mr. J. B. Matthews, who does this sort of dirty work for the Dies Committee, carefully avoided charging any single individual with being a member of any single "Communist-front" organization. Instead, he offered his radical committees in bunches of fifteen or twenty and then published a list of names of individuals who, he said, belonged to "one or more" of them, making it almost impossible to pin him down. We have had time only to check the accusations he makes against two editors of The New Republic, most of which are wholly false. But in any case, his list is utterly ridiculous. According to him, you are a Communist if you are a member of the Union for Democratic Action, which is a well known anti-Communist group of liberals. You are a Communist if you bought the reports of the American Investors' Union or Consumers' Union, which sell technical information about investments or about the quality of advertised goods, respectively. If you ever signed a memorial to protect the civil rights of a Communist, you are a Red; Mr. Matthews cannot imagine anyone's being concerned for civil liberties except for an ulterior motive. You are a Communist if you worked to free Mooney and Billings or the Scottsboro victims. You are a Communist if you objected when the DAR threw Marian Anderson out of its hall in Washington, or if you opposed the embargo on arms to the Spanish Republic.

This sort of thing is a burlesque which has no effect on intelligent and well informed people. How much effect it has on those not in a position to discount such wild accusations, we do not know. We do know, however, that there must be many honest and liberal Republicans who supported the late Wendell Willkie, for example, who must be gravely disturbed at the tone and character the campaign is taking. No good American should want to see his candidate lie his way into the White House. No honest and patriotic man should want to begin a presidential term under such a handicap of deceit. The American people are not stupid; in time they would come to know the deception practised on them, and their resentment would certainly make difficulties for the party in power. The Roosevelt administration has its bad spots; many of them have been pointed out in our pages. But it is a poor opponent who feels his own case to be so weak that he discards almost every legitimate talking point in favor of a campaign of unmitigated and brazen untruth.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, HELEN FULLER (Washington)

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, MALCOLM COWLEY, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, THOMAS SANCTON, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Rich Man's Tax Program

FOR A YEAR NOW, Washingtonians have been puzzled with respect to the activities of the Committee for Economic Development. In a city where office room is extremely scarce, it occupies official quarters in Jesse Jones's Department of Commerce.

The formation of the CED reflects an effort by enterprising men of wealth to get away from the curse that adheres to the names of existing big-business organizations, especially the National Association of Manufacturers and the American Bankers' Association, the curse of long records of unintelligent, unimaginative conservatism. It is a curse that gathered itself quickly also to the name of the Liberty League—a party of rich men that looked like a party of rich men.

The CED is concerned not to look like a party of rich men. Yet it speaks on taxes through a Research Committee that includes two presidents of Federal Reserve Banks, several presidents of large corporations, the dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Thomas Lamont, Eric Johnston and Beardsley Ruml. They have written "A Postwar Federal Tax Plan for High Employment" that is, in fact, an Intelligent Rich Man's Guide to Profits and Prosperity. In that it is an *intelligent* rich man's guide, much has been gained. Its authors, no doubt quite honestly, speak the language of national interest. But, like every other social group, they tend to identify the national interest with their own strength.

Magnitude of Fiscal Operations. – It is refreshing to have a business group recognize that, after demobilization—with a national income of $140 billion, in 1943 prices—we must count on federal expenditures of between $16 and $18 billion per year, not including social-security payments or retirement of debt. It is refreshing, but probably not enough.

It is estimated that it would cost about $4 billion to maintain a navy of the present size on a peace basis, without any allowance for construction or replacement of obsolete equipment. A small professional ground army might be maintained for about $1 billion per year —one-third more than was spent on it in the immediate prewar years—again provided there are no sizable expenditures for new equipment. An air force, however, is likely to cost about as much as the navy, since in that case it is impossible to assume no replacement of equipment. Moreover, the cost of universal military training for an age class of 1,200,000 men for a year is not likely to be under $2 billion, even if they use only old equipment. Therefore, unless a new drive for disarmament materializes, our annual peacetime military expenditures are likely to be on the order of $10 billion during the years immediately after the end of the war in the Far East. This amount is only about one-ninth as much as we have spent for war in the fiscal year 1944, but it is six times as much as we spent in 1940.

In the fiscal year 1940, we also spent $557 million for veterans' benefits. In the fiscal year 1945, we have budgeted for $1,267 million. It would be hazardous to count on expenditures of less than $2½ billion annually, for veterans and their dependents, in the years following demobilization.

The computed annual interest charge on the federal debt is now about $4 billion. In the fiscal year 1944, it increased by $1.1 billion. By June 30, 1945, it will be almost $5 billion. By the time demobilization is completed, it will be at least $5½ billion.

Moreover, excluding defense, veterans, interest, relief and social security, the federal government in 1940 spent more than $3 billion on other peacetime operations. The CED agrees that these functions "are not likely to cost less than before the war."

The sum of these items is $21 billion—and we have as yet provided no funds for social security, public housing or international financing. Even assuming that the two latter operations would be financed entirely from borrowing, it would be a modest social-security program indeed that would be compatible with total expenditures of less than $25 billion. A broad coverage of health, old age and unemployment would bring us nearer to $30 billion.

During the fiscal year 1944, the United States Treasury spent $94 billion. I suggest that, during the years following demobilization, necessary Treasury expenditures (including all social security) may be forecast conservatively at between $25 and $30 billion. This is roughly one-fifth of the national income of $140 billion that the CED forecasts for those years. In providing for a revenue system adequate only to meet expenditures of $16 to $18 billion, the CED takes the easy way which men of wealth are likely to ascribe to popular demagogues.

First Principles. – The CED makes many unexceptionable statements concerning the objectives of taxation, particularly in so far as they relate to stimulating employment. Attention should be directed, however, to the central significance of its principle that "all citizens should contribute some monetary support to the federal government, except those with incomes below minimum subsistence levels." By fixing a personal exemption of $500, the CED defines minimum subsistence at $10 a week. This is the heart of its program, and it is at this point that rich men may tread paths that others will not follow.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The CED stipulates also that, under its program, there will be 40 million individual-income-tax payers. It says that "7,000,000 to 10,000,000 more jobs must be found in private production enterprise than existed in 1940." Now in 1940 there were only 45.2 million persons gainfully occupied (apart from 2.5 million on relief work and 5.1 million "seeking work"). Presumably, therefore, the CED is planning for between 52 and 55 million gainfully occupied, apart from any expansion of the armed forces. With 40 million taxpayers, between 73 and 77 percent of the gainfully occupied would be paying individual income taxes.

I suggest that those who are concerned for the welfare of the mass of our people, as well as for the maintenance of a sufficient volume of effective consumers' demand, should reject this basic principle of the CED's tax program. During the years of peace, the lower 50 percent of our income recipients received only about 21 percent of total consumers' income. Under the CED's program for abolishing corporate income taxes, the share of the lower 50 percent would become even smaller. *The richer 50 percent of our people, who receive about 80 percent of the total consumers' income, can afford to pay all the taxes.* If we are to have about 55 million gainfully occupied, we should have perhaps 28 million income-tax payers, not 40 million.

An old, plausible, but shallow, argument is advanced by the CED against the exclusion of a large number of citizens from direct tax liabilities. This argument is that citizens need to pay taxes to become "aware of their stake in the nation" and to take a responsible attitude toward government. Our citizens have been drafted into the armed forces; they have won and lost jobs as the result of the beginning and termination of government purchases; they see the hand of government in wage controls, in prices, in ration coupons and in a thousand other ways. Surely these citizens do not need to be reminded that they have a government by being forced to pay taxes that they cannot afford.

Pay-Roll Taxes. – The CED defers any systematic consideration of social-security revenues. It does, however, make the ominous incidental suggestion that social security be handled "separately from the rest of the federal budget." Since the corporate and individual income taxes are treated as integral to the general federal budget, there is an implied sanction of the special pay-roll taxes. The handling of this matter indicates the school of liberalism with which the CED is to be identified.

Of all our taxes, those on pay rolls are the most inequitable and perhaps the most repressive of a high level of employment. They are taxes on wages and salaries, to the exclusion of other forms of income. They recognize no income too small to be taxed. They are imposed on the income that is most likely to be spent for consumption. They are taxes on employment, prejudicing the position of firms in whose total costs wages are relatively important to the advantage of firms whose costs consist primarily of fixed capital or materials.

As individual income taxes are now computed, the pay-roll taxes have a further inequitable feature. Even the tax deducted directly from the employee's pay check is not an "allowable deduction" in calculating how much individual income tax he owes. The wage earner, therefore, pays a tax on income that he never received and over which he had no voluntary disposal. The CED is much concerned over the "double taxation" of corporate dividends, but it says nothing about this double taxation which hits only wage earners.

Corporate Income Tax. – The central theme of the CED's tax program is an attack on corporate income taxes. Present tax law recognizes the corporation as a legal entity separable from the individuals who have property interests in that entity. The law now taxes the equity income of the corporation in addition to the dividend incomes of its individual stockholders. Income paid out in the form of interest, on the other hand, is not taxed as part of the corporation's income. This procedure creates a preference for corporate debt financing, rather than equity financing. The corporate income tax also discriminates against an equity interest in corporate enterprise as compared to any other form of property holding. By reducing the reward for successful corporate risk-taking, it deters investment and employment.

This argument is familiar to students of public finance and—in its broad outline—has been accepted by most of them. For any given combination of corporate and individual income taxes, it is theoretically possible to substitute an individual income tax that will have (1) the same total revenue yield, (2) the same general incidence as among broad income groups, (3) greater equity as among individual taxpayers, and (4) less deterrent pressure on corporate risk-taking. The corporate income tax has been favored in the past because it was politically an easier way of taxing rich people than any other available.

That the corporate income tax *is* a progressive tax on rich people should be made very clear. Its progressive incidence is obscured by the fact that the tax is levied at a flat rate. An individual with an income of $3,000 may receive $100 in corporate dividends, which would have been $167 but for a corporate income tax of 40 percent: the tax has deprived him of an amount equal to a little more than 2 percent of his actual income. Another individual with an income of $50,000 may receive $15,000 in corporate dividends, which would have been $25,000 but for the same flat tax: the tax has deprived him of an amount equal to 20 percent of his actual income.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These examples are not taken at random; they reflect actual prewar experience. In the peace years for which we have data, less than three percent of all income received by persons having incomes under $5,000 was derived from corporate dividends, but nearly one-quarter of all income above $5,000 was derived from such dividends. In 1935, for instance, dividends accounted for 2.4 percent of all income for people below the $5,000 class, but 11.5 percent of income between $5,000 and $10,000, fully 40.1 percent of incomes in the $50,000 to $100,000 class, and 78 percent of the incomes above $1,000,000. In that year, the highest one percent of all income recipients received 59.7 percent of all the dividends. It is clear, therefore, that *a tax on corporate income withdraws funds that would otherwise accrue primarily to relatively rich people.* In view of the manner in which the CED passes over other tax inequities and deterrents to employment, it is perhaps not unfair to conclude that it is particularly conscious of the evils of corporate income taxes because they impose their burden on the community through their effects on the economic activities of wealthy people.

One peculiarity of the CED's suggestions with respect to corporate taxes needs special underlining: this is the treatment of undistributed profits. In the case of distributed profits, the CED dissolves the bonds of the corporation; it looks beneath the legal form to the actual living persons, and taxes the corporation's profits, only once, as individual income. The magnitude of the tax is, therefore, dependent on the tax bracket into which the individual income falls. Not so for undistributed profits. Obviously these undistributed profits could be imputed to the individual shareholders, in accordance with the number of shares held, and could be taxed on a progressive scale. Here, however, the CED reaffirms the corporate entity. It breathes life again into the legal fiction, and suggests that undistributed corporate profits be taxed only in accordance with the rate for the lowest individual income bracket. By this device, the corporate tax liabilities on the CED's estimated undistributed profits of $4.8 billion are reduced by about $1 to $1½ billion below what they would be if the corporate fiction were disregarded throughout. As a compensation for this lop-sided treatment, the CED offers the eventual full taxation of capital gains, not to be established now but when "substantial reductions in corporate and personal income taxes have been effected."

Personal Income Taxes. – The CED's personal-income-tax plan has three features: (1) everybody gets prizes, (2) the largest prizes (relatively as well as absolutely) go to the largest incomes, and (3) old individual-income-tax abuses are not mentioned.

In the fiscal year 1944, in which the national income was about 10 percent larger than the $140 billion of the CED's "reference year," the Treasury collected $43.7 billion (apart from $1.7 billion of pay-roll taxes). The CED reduces total collections to between $17.1 and $19.5 billion. Naturally it has some fine prizes to distribute.

In 1943 total corporate profits were $23.7 billion before taxes and $8.9 billion after taxes; national income was $147.9 billion. In its "reference year" the CED forecasts a national income of $140 billion, corporate profits before taxes of $13 billion, and after taxes, of between $12 and $12.2 billion. This is the biggest prize, and—as indicated above—it goes primarily to the highest one percent of the income scale.

However, the above comparison is not entirely fair since, under the CED's program, prosperous individuals will have larger incomes because their dividends have not been cut at the corporate level, and therefore they will be in a position to pay more individual income taxes. In fact, however, collections under the CED program of personal income taxes are designed to yield only $10.9 to $13.2 billion, compared with the $18.3 billion actually collected in the fiscal year 1944.

The individual exemption has been left at $500. The three-percent "normal" rate has been eliminated throughout. Then the successive bracket rates have been lowered by 22 percent of the present rate on the first $2,000 of taxable income, by 32 percent for the bracket between $14,000 and $23,000, by 46 percent for the bracket between $73,000 and $98,000, and by smaller percentages for higher brackets. These reductions are obviously based on the premises that revenue needs will permit both abolition of corporate income taxes and drastic reductions of individual income taxes, particularly the income taxes on prosperous people.

I suggest that these premises are wishful thinking. If we are to abolish corporate income taxes and provide adequate exemptions for the poorer half of our population who receive only one-fifth of the total income, our individual income tax will have to be constructed quite differently. It will need to have an initial bracket rate of at least 30 percent, rather than the CED's 16-20 percent, and will have to rise much more rapidly to its peak than the CED schedule. In short, if the corporate income tax is to be abolished, the yield of the individual income tax will have to be increased—not decreased—in comparison with its present level. The increased yield can be derived from the same general income strata as those which receive the greater part of all corporate dividends.

Two characteristic omissions occur in the CED's discussion of the personal income tax: joint returns and the imputed income from owner-occupied housing. The requirement that all members of the same family file joint returns is a prerequisite for the carrying out of the principle of taxation according to ability to pay, a principle to which the CED gives verbal adherence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the enforcement of joint returns would strike at the tax avoidance of rich people. The CED tax program decorously avoids any mention of the matter.

Similar decorum and silence are preserved on the taxation of imputed rents. People who own their own homes avoid considerable taxes due to the loophole in our tax law which fails to include the imputed rents from such housing in taxable income. This is not a small matter, because home-owners are representatively prosperous people, at least in urban communities, and the annual total of imputed rents for owner-occupied houses is on the order of $3½ billion.

Summary. – Further detailed justification of the general judgment that the CED has sponsored an intelligent tax program, for rich men, might be drawn from what its tax statement says—and leaves unsaid—with respect to excises, and estate, gift and inheritance taxes. But perhaps enough has been said above to suggest the school of liberalism to which the CED belongs. The rich men who have set forth the CED's tax road to national prosperity have not displayed the imagination, the sense of public responsibility or the *noblesse oblige* to establish themselves as safe guides for a popular following.

OSCAR GASS

France Plans Her Future

EVEN AS EARLY as the days in Algiers, General de Gaulle had won the adherence of the French masses because, without mentioning the word "revolution," he nevertheless represented a revolutionary idea. The program which united Communists, Radicals, Socialists, Christian Democrats, Resistance Delegates and the CGT (trade unions) in the Assembly, and in the reconstituted Committee of April 1, (the Government of Rassemblement National) was revolutionary. "Against collaborators and the trusts!" meant that liberation would be accompanied by the transfer of power from the dominant classes—which is the essence of any revolution. Before 1940, no French government could function except by the grace of the real holders of authority, the 200 banking, industrial and landowning families who, with trusts, press and an effective liaison with the army as their instruments, ran the country. Pétain's "authoritarian revolution" was no revolution at all. Though the political form of government changed, power stayed in the same hands as under the Third Republic—except that now, in the État Français, they were collaborating with the German occupant for the mutual purpose of ruling France.

As long as the Giraud-de Gaulle conflict was unresolved, the claimants to supersede Vichy's authority were twofold—the Conservative Giraudists and the Revolutionary Gaullists. Giraud wanted to liberate France and strengthen tradition. De Gaulle wanted not only to liberate but also to "renovate." He called for new men and new methods of government. He wanted the Fourth Republic, but a republic with "a government that will govern." He wanted both a political and an economic revolution. Every party in the Resistance Movement wanted an economic revolution and the transfer of power, but the Gaullists were the most dynamic in urging a change in the constitutional form of government; without defining it, they wanted a political revolution with a strong central authority, supported, according to the Resistance organization, Combat's, proposal, by a Parti Unique (single party). How far has this position changed?

Today the stage of liberation is over; the 200 families have fled, have been imprisoned or are in retirement. The major physical authority which protected them—the authority of the Nazis—now rests with the Allies who have avowed that they don't intend to dictate a government to the French. The revolutionary stage has begun in which the contenders for state power, de Gaulle and his Gaullists, the National Council of Resistance and the FFI, are maneuvering to seize it. The FFI, who are showing some reluctance to surrender their physical power, are beginning to realize that it is not enough for a revolutionary force to have weapons. To achieve a revolution, force must be directed to specific purposes. During the last war, the sailors of Kiel mutinied; but when they put forward their demands, they could only insist that they shouldn't have to say "Sir" so often to their officers. As a body, the FFI, lacking a political program, doesn't quite know where or how to apply its strength. It consists, in fact, partly of those who give their allegiance to de Gaulle through the regional groups of the Resistance Movement, represented on the National Council of Resistance, and partly of the Communist Franc-Tireurs et Partisans, whose first loyalty is to their party.

For de Gaulle, the problem is not to prevent the FFI from becoming a political organization, competing with his own authority, but to prevent it from becoming the political militia of the Resistance Movement with which he now shares authority. At present, de Gaulle's moral authority counterbalances the alternative leadership which the political parties are offering France. He knows that the glamor of liberation won't last indefinitely, and is therefore advancing the program of economic change which corresponds with the aspirations of the people, the Resistance and the FFI, whom he wants not only to neutralize physically but to win politically.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On September 18, the Movement of National Liberation put forward a short-term policy at the Salle Pleyel—nationalization, punishment of collaborators, establishment of works committees and "renovation" of the army. It is the common, economic revolutionary program of both Gaullists and the political parties. De Gaulle, concessive to the Communists, placatory to the Resistance, faithful to the Gaullists, *tout purs*, after rallying France behind himself, as the leader of the liberation, wants to be the leader of the Revolution too. The Socialists have not forgiven him for allowing Combat to sponsor the idea of a single authoritarian party. Seeing an inclination, on his part, to pack the Assembly with Gaullists, both the Communists and the Socialists want the political parties to have an increased representation of deputies.

Writing in Le Populaire, Robert Verdier, joint secretary of the Socialist Party, says, "The '*parti unique*' is a fraud of dictators. It is impossible to conceive a live democracy without several parties." In L'Aube, Marc Sanguier writes, "We want the Republic, we demand democracy.... We mustn't aim at a superficial uniformity of thought." And at a meeting in the Salle Wagram, André Philip, the Socialist ex-Minister of State, says, "The Republic is the Fourth in name, but in reality it is the eternal Republic."

There is, in short, a strong opposition to any attempt by de Gaulle and the "*hommes nouveaux*" (new men) to make a political revolution without popular assent. It is only on the economic plane that the revolution is rolling forward unimpeded by party controversy. At the meeting of the Liberation Movement on September 15, Robert Lacoste, Minister for Industrial Production, said, "The nation must be mistress of the country's industrial activity. We want to liberate the state from its subjection to financial power, in order to carry out the policy of a free people."

A resolution was carried, advocating the immediate nationalization of the great enterprises of national interest, electrical resources, heavy industry, insurance and the big banks. Don't think that this was some snap vote of the extreme left. On the contrary, the Communists were not represented at this meeting. Robert Lacoste, a leading member of the Civil Servants' Trade Union, Emmanuel d'Astier de la Vigerie, former Minister of the Interior, and Henri Frenay, Minister for Prisoners, who were three of the principal speakers, have always been considered moderates, tending to the Right, and are representatives of the Gaullist Resistants. If then, there are any, in Britain and America, who look to de Gaulle as a counter-balance to France's revolutionary tendencies, they are mistaken. De Gaulle's recent speech at Lille in which he promised a planned economy, government control of natural resources and an end to concentration of economic power in the hands of trusts and cartels, is in point. Iron, coal, steel, chemicals, gas and electric supply, armaments and communications are the first instalment of the industries to be nationalized, in accordance with the plan prepared by Paul Giaccobi, the Radical Socialist, then Commissioner for Production in Algiers.

Pierre Mendès-France, Minister of National Economy, former Commissioner of Finance, is head of the group of ministers concerned with the reconstruction of industry which includes René Mayer, Minister of Communications, a member of the Rothschild family, but not of any political party, and a former director of the Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer Français, and Lacoste. The measures of nationalization won't be in the hands of amateurs.

What do American and British conservative big business think of these goings-on in France? If the contemplated changes in France's economic life were merely the plans of the Communists, they might be halted fairly easily, as in Holland, where the state of siege, announced by the business men's government of Dr. Gerbrandy, has ensured that Communist influence can be restricted. But as Mr. Morgan Heiskell, the representative of one of the most important United States cable companies, complained, "What can you do when a man like Mayer, a former director of International Wagon-Lits and Air France, starts talking of nationalizing communications?"

The British have already sent an industrial commission to France to advise the French on the rehabilitation of industry and its coöperation in the Allied industrial effort. Presumably, it will act as observer for the Federation of British Industries on the new forms of industrial organization in France—and on their various disturbing consequences. If industries in which there are already heavy British and American investments are to be nationalized, what compensation will the investors receive? Will it mean, for example, the complete exclusion of Anglo-American telegraph companies from France? Reuters and the United Press fought M. Bonnet on the question of the single news agency which he decreed in Algiers. They won. M. Bonnet's successor at the Commissariat of Information, M. Tietgen, had to repeal the decree. Nationalization and the prohibition of foreign ownership, as in the case of the press, will still further limit opportunities for trade and investment in France. British and American business men will not resign these benefits without a fight, and since France is going to be partly dependent on Anglo-American trade for some time to come, it is doubtful whether the government will be successful in immediately making effective those measures of nationalization and trade control which Anglo-American business wants to resist, as in the case of the *Agence Unique*.

There is already a minor Anglo-United States squabble as to who is to get first foot in the French market. The British complain that G5 in the United States

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Army is sending numbers of men to France, in the guise of officers, who, in reality, are merely business men—agronomists who are seed-salesmen, relief workers who sell branded products, public-relations officers who are simply prospecting for postwar trade. Obviously, that isn't the official policy of G5; and even if it were an unofficial policy, the infiltration of a few business patrols wouldn't matter much. Thoughtful American and British business men are less disturbed that a few of their number should steal a march on one another, than that the French government should steal a march on them all.

Big business, like the American State Department, hasn't given up all hope of a stable, conservative policy for France. Lemaigre-Dubreuil, an ex-Cagoulard and member of the Comité des Forges, and his colleague Jean Rigaud (who had been Robert Murphy's go-between with Giraud in North Africa) were the last, and unsuccessful, bid of United States diplomacy to make a deal with French big business. The revolution was already in train when the two industrialists started off on their journey to France via Tangiers and Spain. Only one element of stability remains—the Catholic Church.

What is the attitude of the French people to the Church and to the collaborationist clergy? The small clergy were either non-collaborationist, or collaborationist only in the sense of functionaries who did their job. They celebrated mass, heard confession and gave the sacrament to Germans and Vichyists and patriots, according to their beliefs. The actively Resistant clergy hid the persecuted, lent their complicity to meetings in church, and helped their congregations to endure the Occupation.

The higher clergy behaved variously. In Lyons and Bordeaux, the Archbishops published noble protests against the deportation of Jews. But in Paris, Cardinal Suhard officiated at the funeral of Henriot, the assassinated Vichy Minister of Information, and denounced Anglo-American bombing. A few months ago, the National Council of Resistance was considering an address to the Pope, asking him to unhat the Cardinal, though without any hope that this would be effective except as a demonstration, since the Vatican could hardly be expected to take disciplinary measures against prelates and dignitaries whose pronouncements were in accord with papal opinion. The Resistance in Paris was not particularly pleased that Archbishop Spellman should have lunched with Cardinal Suhard. They feared that it was an indication of the ambivalent policy of the American State Department, which, while dealing with the Provisional Government, is trying to keep contacts with right-wing clerical opinion in France through the Church, for remoter political aims.

The Resistance has neither the power to remove, nor the wish to prolong a feud with, the collaborationist clergy. But it will certainly watch for any attempt on the part of the Church to protect lay collaborationists. It will hold it as a double offense against France if cardinals, who failed to defend patriots, shield traitors under the pretext of charity.

Catholic France is not fully represented in the government, since "*les dévots*" are chiefly the peasants. Afraid of communism and atheism, they were the chief supporters of Franco during the Spanish civil war. As their influence has lately declined, it is to be expected that the government will engage in a more dynamic policy toward Spain, once the formal diplomatic situation is clearer. For purposes of convenience, both in Tangiers and Spain proper, the National Committee had representatives who were its acknowledged agents in financial matters and in helping, for example, the refugees who passed through the Miranda internment camp on their way to North Africa. In ratio to Germany's setbacks, Franco's relations with the National Committee tended to become more friendly. In Algiers, the papers ABC and Ya had correspondents who sent fairly sympathetic dispatches.

Georges Bidault, the present French Foreign Minister, was energetically anti-Franco, at the time of the civil war, in his contributions to L'Aube, and it is unlikely that either he or Franco will have forgotten. As was expected, he has dismissed M. Petri, Vichy Ambassador to Madrid, and a Gaullist *chargé d'affaires* is already functioning, waiting on the issue of recognition or otherwise. But now the diplomatic balance has changed, and in future it may not be a question of whether Franco recognizes de Gaulle but of whether de Gaulle recognizes Franco. The attitude of Russia is likely to be decisive in influencing France's attitude. For nearly two years, de Gaulle has maintained good relations with the USSR through Bogomolov—a friendship which was of considerable diplomatic use to him when the British and Americans were showing coolness. In foreign policy, de Gaulle hasn't committed himself to any of the three governments. But the internal pressure of the Left, added to the advantages of occasionally coördinating his program in European affairs with that of Russia, will incline de Gaulle to deal more firmly with Franco than did any of his predecessors.

This gravitation toward Russia has a simple basis. Stalin has never shown any inclination to diminish French sovereignty. On the contrary, he has been most urgent in wishing its reëstablishment, and in recognizing the Provisional Government as the authority qualified to preserve it. In the question of whether the French colonies—Martinique, French Guiana, Dakar, St. Pierre and Miquelon—should be internationalized, the man who answers for France is de Gaulle; and he says "No," as he said two years ago that French sovereignty shall not be diminished. "The territories of the empire," he said at Brazzaville, "wherever and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whatever they are, belong to no one if not to France." Neither Bidault as Foreign Minister, nor René Pleven, the Anglicized Minister for Colonies—a former business man who wants to model the French colonial administration on the British colonial service—could afford, at the present time, to acquiesce in a one-sided surrender of that sovereignty for whose restoration a million Frenchmen have fought and suffered. If there is to be internationalization of colonies, say the French, let it apply to the imperial possessions of every country, not only to our own. We are not in tutelage either to Britain or America. It is quite certain that until France has been restored to a great power she will resent as an insult any attempt by Mr. Roosevelt to remove from her, however paternally, the gun which he seems to think the colonies represent, pointing at the USA.

Paris MAURICE EDELMAN

The Next Congress

II. *Prospects in the House of Representatives*

According to the purposes of the Founding Fathers, the Senate, giving equal representation to all states, large and small, was to provide protection for state sovereignty, while the House, elected on the basis of population, was to represent the people as a whole, regardless of state lines. The theory was good; the practice has been questionable. The wide discrepancy in the size of congressional districts, designated by state legislatures which are often motivated by partisan politics, together with the completely undemocratic poll tax in eight states, has vitiated the original theory. Thus in 1940 Representative Cox of Georgia was elected by 19,443 voters (to 636 for his opponent) while his colleague, the late Representative Schuetz of Illinois, had to win the majority of 449,954 votes. Such discrepancies are not due exclusively to the existence of the poll tax: Representative Schuetz was elected in the Seventh District in Illinois, while his fellow Democrat in the neighboring Eighth District, Representative Kocialkowski, had to win the majority of only 51,306 votes, slightly more than 10 percent of Schuetz's electorate.

It is therefore impossible to analyze or forecast the elections for the lower House either on the basis of the predicted national popular vote or on the basis of state-by-state analyses, as was attempted for the Senate in last week's New Republic. Very general conclusions can be reached only by assessing the balance of forces in the present House and studying previous elections.

Since all 435 seats in the House are at stake, while only 35 senatorial seats are being contested, it is clear that the situation as regards the House is far more fluid than it is in the Senate. Furthermore, the present margin of Democratic control in the higher body is so great that it is unlikely, even in the event of a Dewey victory, that this control will be shifted to the Republicans. On the other hand, it is conceivable, although improbable, that the President could be elected by a small electoral-college margin, and still lose party control of the House. The present line-up, after several by-elections since 1942, includes 215 Democrats, 212 Republicans and 4 minor party members, with 4 vacancies. In other words, the chief battle is for formal party control, which would be shifted by a Republican gain of only two seats.

Let no one underestimate the importance of party control in American legislative bodies. In the House of Representatives it carries with it the position of Speaker, or presiding officer, with power to appoint committees; it means also the chairmanship of every House committee, as well as a party majority on every committee. The order in which legislation is introduced, the parliamentary procedure according to which the debate is carried on, all depend largely on party control. It is true that the actual voting control in recent Houses has been in the hands of the Unholy Alliance of Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans, but the administration's formal control has avoided disaster in any number of instances. Loss of this control in the Seventy-ninth House would pit the legislature completely against the executive branch. Some idea of what this would mean in terms of the all-important committee chairmanships can be gleaned merely by mentioning that Taber of New York would head the Appropriations Committee; Wolcott of Michigan, Banking and Currency; Dondero of Michigan, Education; Mason of Illinois, Immigration and Naturalization; Fish of New York, Rules; and Knutson of Minnesota, Ways and Means. A more die-hard reactionary set of legislators is impossible to imagine.

Fortunately such a disaster seems improbable unless Dewey should fool the experts and win the election. But the possibility cannot be completely overlooked. Forty incumbent House members will not be in the Seventy-ninth Congress, either because of primary defeat or retirement. Thirty of these are Democrats, nine Republicans and one Progressive (Sauthoff of Wisconsin, who will most certainly be replaced by a Republican). While most of these incumbents will probably be replaced by members of their respective

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties, clearly the Democrats lose the enormous advantage of incumbency in a preponderant number of districts. The present margin of three seats is too slim for comfort.

Nevertheless, administration supporters are justified in their belief that the probabilities favor the Democrats. A large vote would be the most important item in their favor. Although the total vote this year will undoubtedly be far less than four years ago, it will be greater than the off-year of 1942. Since 1936, when the administration reached the high mark in House control (333 to 89, with 13 independents), the Democrats lost ground in both the off-year elections of 1938 and 1942, but gained slightly in the intervening presidential year of 1940. As a matter of fact, considering the enormous electoral-vote margin for Roosevelt against Willkie, the gain of only five seats by the Democrats was extremely slight.

While there will undoubtedly be a number of isolated victories and defeats of liberal congressional candidates, the best chances of substantial gains for the administration are in a number of states with industrial populations where previous elections have been close. In this classification, Connecticut may be regarded as typical. The Connecticut delegation elected in 1940 was one of the best in the House, but five liberal Democrats went down to defeat two years ago. Ohio's present delegation includes nine fewer Democrats than were elected in that state in 1940. Pennsylvania has lost six Democrats since the Seventy-seventh Congress, Missouri five and Illinois five. In other words, the Democrats have lost 30 House seats in these 5 states out of a national total of 55 since the election of 1940. Most of these losses were by extremely small margins in industrial areas where the traditionally larger vote in presidential years and the intensive activity of organized labor this year should make some Democratic gains probable on November 7. This seems a safe prediction despite the fact that Roosevelt may not carry all five states as he did in 1940. Together with isolated gains elsewhere, the results in these five states should solidify Democratic control in the House.

However, even a gain of 20 or 25 Democratic seats would by no means assure a progressive House for the next two years. On the contrary, it is probable that the next House will remain under the control of the present Unholy Alliance. The incumbent House passed the Harness amendment to the Smith-Connally Act, aimed at the political activity of labor, by a margin of 103 votes; voted against the President's subsidy program by 75 votes; rejected the federal ballot for servicemen by 56 votes; and refused, by the overwhelming margin of 149 votes, to compromise with the Senate on travel allowance for war workers stranded away from home. The defeat of such moderate legislative measures by such wide margins indicates clearly that it will take a victory of almost landslide proportions to produce a Seventy-ninth House capable of meeting the problems this country will face during the next two crucial years.

Any analysis of House elections points a moral of extreme political significance. There can be no all-out liberal legislature in America unless large sections of the farm population are won over to the progressive cause. This can be proved mathematically. It is a simple fact that there are not enough congressional districts where organized labor and independent liberals can together elect their candidates, not even with the support of a liberal President and a party machine which backs him. Although there are many exceptions, it is generally true that the congressional delegations from the large urban centers are fairly liberal, or at least they string along with a mildly progressive legislative program. Pittsburgh, for example, elects relatively progressive Representatives in good years and bad, whether the turn-out is large or small. A large labor vote in Pittsburgh can affect both the presidential and the senatorial vote in Pennsylvania. But Pittsburgh workers can have no influence whatsoever in the House elections in rural Pennsylvania. The same can be said of Detroit, New York, Chicago and other large industrial centers. During the early years of the New Deal, because Republican reaction had shown itself completely incapable of solving farm problems, some of the most liberal members of the House came from rural areas. Furthermore, a liberal farm Representative is often more independent, even more radical, than the ordinary machine politician elected from an urban center who accepts a decent legislative program out of political expediency rather than conviction. The tragedy of the present congressional situation lies in the simple fact that the administration has lost most of its farm support. Despite the effective activity of organized labor and big-city liberals, there will be no far-reaching improvement in the House of Representatives unless and until a progressive program recaptures the farmers. The labor movement would be well advised to consider this simple mathematical fact in the development of its future legislative and political programs. And it may not be beside the point to suggest that Henry Wallace could make a great contribution to a progressive America by giving organizational consideration to this problem after his term of office expires.

As in the case of the Senate, the character of the next Congress can be considerably affected by the defeat of a number of outstanding reactionaries and their replacement by fighting liberals, even if a mathematical majority of progressives is not obtained. Of at least equal importance is the reëlection of those incumbents who have borne the brunt of the fighting in recent legislative battles, since their defeat would be taken as a repudiation of the issues for which they fought. While it is clearly impossible to mention all such cases, any list of progressive incumbents with tough battles for re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

election would include Representatives Izac and Outland of California, Dilweg of Wisconsin, Jackson of Washington and Bradley of Pennsylvania, whose opponent in a reapportioned district is incumbent Republican Pratt.

Of the 435 contests the campaign against Hamilton Fish of New York has understandably attracted most public attention on a national scale. Fish's opponent, Augustus Bennet, actively supported by Helen Hayes, Maxwell Anderson and many other distinguished citizens in the district, won 44 percent of the vote in the Republican primary. Bennet, although a Republican supporting Dewey, has the endorsement of the Democratic, American Labor and Liberal Parties in the finals, in addition to being listed on an Independent Republican line. If Thomas Jefferson will turn over in his grave for a moment, it can be revealed that Fish has filed as a "Jeffersonian Democrat"! Since the reapportionment in New York State left Fish only one of the four counties he has represented for the past twenty years, the chances of defeating him are excellent. The small margin of some 4,000 votes out of almost 95,000 cast by which Fish won two years ago against a Democrat, together with Bennet's strength in the new counties, are grounds for hope.

A contest of no less importance is that for Representative-at-large in Illinois, where Emily Taft Douglas, wife of Professor Paul Douglas (now United States Marine captain), is waging a vigorous fight against Stephen Day, who is said to have sent out more Nazi literature under his frank than any other member of Congress. Day, who faithfully follows the philosophy of Colonel McCormick, has won twice by small margins—less than 52,000 votes in 1940 out of almost 4 million. The fact that Mrs. Douglas, though a Chicagoan, is independent of the Kelly machine, should gain her many downstate votes, which will be essential for victory in a state that may well go Republican.

In Connecticut, the self-appointed spokesman for America's war casualties, Clare Luce, is being opposed by a young Irish lawyer, Margaret Connors, who has characterized Mrs. Luce's speeches as "glibaloney." It is sometimes forgotten that the spokesman for our war dead cannot actually speak for the majority of her own district, having won election two years ago with a minority vote due to the nomination of a "socialist" candidate by Bridgeport's "socialist" mayor, Jasper McLevy. A Democratic sweep in Connecticut, aided by the intense activity of the Political Action Committee, might well overcome money, publicity and glamor around Fairfield County.

Two years ago one of the few all-out progressive victories was won by Howard McMurray against the violently anti-British Lewis Thill in Milwaukee. With McMurray now running for the Senate, Thill is attempting a comeback. His Democratic opponent, Andrew Biemiller, has had an outstanding record in the labor movement, in the Wisconsin state legislature and more recently in the War Production Board. He should beat Thill in a close race. Among other contests in which reactionary incumbents are having trouble are those of Archibald Young against Carl Hinshaw of California, Edward Kelly of Chicago (no relation to the mayor) against Dies Committee member Fred Busby, and A. J. Resa against conservative Charles Dewey, congressional spokesman for Sewell Avery in the Montgomery Ward case.

If, as has been indicated, there is little chance of electing a clear majority of crusading liberals, the real hope in the Seventy-ninth House lies in the formation of a fighting bloc, however small, which will have the courage, the intelligence and the energy to bring the issues so clearly before the country that public pressure will force the middle-of-the-roaders to pass at least a minimum amount of progressive legislation. The quality of the pro-administration representatives will be almost as important as their quantity. At the risk of slighting many good candidates, these contests may be mentioned in addition to those already discussed:

In California Helen Gahagan Douglas should win without too great difficulty and replace liberal Representative Tom Ford who has retired. Similarly, former Lieutenant-Governor Ellis Patterson should win the seat vacated by Will Rogers Jr., who has returned to armed service. Hal Styles, who defeated Dies Committee member John M. Costello in the primaries, should be returned from the Fifteenth California District. A number of former Representatives who were towers of progressive strength during their incumbency are staging comebacks after their defeats two years ago. In northern Michigan the power trust ganged up on Frank Hook in 1942 and elected conservative John Bennett. The latter voted as predicted in the last sessions, but tried to appease labor by opposing the Smith-Connally bill. However, labor has not been fooled and is waging a strong campaign to put Hook back in the House, where he is sorely needed. Herman Koppelmann of Hartford, Connecticut, usually wins in the presidential years and is defeated in the off-years. Hence he should be returned this year if labor does more than pass resolutions of endorsement. In industrial Canton, Ohio, William Thom has a good chance of defeating Republican Representative H. H. Carson, his successful opponent of two years ago. If the miners pay as little attention to John L. Lewis' political advice as they have in the past, Kent Keller of southern Illinois, who has more vigor at 80 than most congressmen at 40, could defeat reactionary C. W. ("Runt") Bishop, who just squeezed through in 1940.

At least two contests are setting a new pattern in American political life, with college students crusading to send their liberal professors to Congress. Professor Vernon O'Rourke of Swarthmore, now on leave in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armed forces, is running against Republican James Wolfenden, whose record is one of consistent reactionary voting. In Evanston and Chicago's North Shore suburbs, Professor Curtis MacDougal of Northwestern, aided by the Independent Voters of Illinois and the organized collegiate community, is campaigning against The Chicago Tribune's hero, Ralph Church.

If a number of these fighting liberals win through next month and the incumbent progressives are returned to office, there will be a strong nucleus for the formation of a progressive House bloc that can give leadership, not only to their less outspoken colleagues, but to the liberal forces throughout the country without whose increased activity no decent legislative program will have the slightest chance. Immediate steps looking toward the formation of such a bloc in the Seventy-ninth House should be one of the first items on the post-election agenda. JAMES LOEB JR.

Henry J. Taylor: Soft-Spoken Pegler

HENRY J. TAYLOR is a comparative newcomer to radio but already is referred to as the soft-spoken Westbrook Pegler of the air waves. This Blue Network commentator is also a staff writer for the Scripps-Howard chain and in both capacities manages nobly to hew to the Pegler line. Where Pegler, now on Hearst's payroll, uses uncouth, heavy-handed phrases to smear the Roosevelt administration, labor and all else his jaundiced eyes survey, Taylor accomplishes the same result by an adroit use of clever distortion, sly innuendo and outright suppression of the truth.

Taylor has gained notoriety on at least two occasions, his assault upon America's merchant seamen being the most recent. General Charles de Gaulle, Sidney Hillman and the CIO Political Action Committee also are targets of Taylor's barbs, but he has only words of approbation for personalities like Franco of Spain, Salazar of Portugal and Ryti of Finland. For a clearer insight into the workings of his mind let us first consider his radio attack upon our seamen, which provoked an avalanche of protests from the National Maritime Union, the War Shipping Administration, the American Merchant Marine Institute and PM. No other broadcast he has made drew such universal criticism, although it is a rare week that fails to evoke telephoned and written protests against some Tayor-made charges. Nevertheless the Blue Network continues to give him free rein on his unsponsored nightly program.

On March 9 Taylor essayed to prove that our merchant seamen are earning such high wages as to threaten American postwar trade prospects. He illustrated his point with a tale of a young friend back from delivering a war cargo to Europe who received "over $2,000" for what every listener was led to believe was a six-weeks joyride as "an apprentice engineer . . . watching the throttle . . . [on] a glorified tramp steamer." There is no apprentice-engineer rating in the merchant marine. Taylor later claimed he meant to say that his friend, "who had never been at sea before," was actually a third assistant engineer. The War Shipping Administration, however, states that no man can get that rating without prior service at sea for fourteen months, plus four months of study in a government school; then he must pass a Coast Guard examination.

Even the Hearst press (Pegler please note) admits that our merchant seamen are engaged in a "highly hazardous service . . . [and] are second to none in bravery." But Taylor, intent on giving further currency to the widely circulated myth of fabulous earnings of seamen, did not hesitate to impugn their courage and patriotism. Scathingly denouncing the port-attack bonus, one of several types of wartime bonuses paid to seamen in lieu of wage increases, he charged:

"Any time a vessel . . . is at dock or at sea and an airplane stages what is called an attack . . . every last man aboard that ship, except the officers and the men of the United States Navy . . . receives a bombing bonus of $125 . . . for each individual bombing. If a single plane drops a bomb within the area of an American ship—and this bonus, I might mention, has been paid for instances in which the bombs fell as much as four miles away—the bonus applies . . . each time this occurs." To make his meaning crystal clear to his listeners, whom he advised "to write some of these figures down," he added: "If the bombs are dropped in the morning and again in the afternoon two bonuses are paid—$250 extra that day to every member of the crew from cabin boy on up."

The Maritime War Emergency Board, which determines how much and where war-risk bonuses are to apply, declared these statements to be "reckless and unfounded" in a letter to Mark Woods, president of the Blue Network. The American Merchant Marine Institute, leading industry spokesman, wrote Taylor on March 14: "You mention a 'bombing bonus' of $125. The official name is 'port-attack bonus' and is paid only once for each port. . . . For instance, if a vessel should be in the Port of Naples for four days and during . . . that time is bombed seven or eight times, each man receives only $125." The AMMI official added this comment: "Despite all this bonus, we think that your friend misinformed you when he said he received over $2,000 for a six-weeks voyage. Or perhaps we heard it wrong and you said six months,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which is much more likely." The War Shipping Administration has painstakingly sought, but with scant success, to show that earnings of merchant seamen, including wages, bonuses and overtime, are not greater, and in most categories less, than comparable ratings in the navy; PM on February 3 last published a full page of WSA facts and figures to help spike divisive rumors such as those aired by Taylor.

The National Maritime Union, largest seamen's organization in the country, raised a further valid point of criticism in its request for radio time to refute Taylor, namely, his gratuitous slur on the integrity, loyalty and patriotism of foreign-born seamen. For Taylor had selected this sentence to conclude his broadcast: "Further, I am sorry to say my friend is not a citizen of our country." PM, in devoting a full page on April 10 to the WSA's answers to Taylor's charges, asserted that this sentence "is one of the slimiest and most maliciously misleading statements in the whole broadcast." WSA records reveal that our merchant-marine casualty lists include hundreds of foreign-born seamen who died in the service of our country, and many more who survived torpedo attacks by enemy planes and submarines.

PM's exposé prodded Taylor into making his "retraction" that evening. In unctuous, indulgent tones he declared "there does not need to be any malice," and serenely proceeded to overlook the true facts abundantly before him and to voice a new slander against the seamen: "Instead of a bombing bonus of $125 being paid more than once a day . . . they say it is limited to one bonus each day." His corrections, all confined to seamen's earnings, with the exception of his friend's proper rating, were delivered in such manner as to ridicule the idea that anyone should have dreamed of calling attention to any discrepancies in his original broadcast. He directed that ridicule toward the NMU by twisting his own meaning into the devastating figures PM had published that morning and blandly announcing they were "the union's own figures supplied to me." He shed crocodile tears for the men "who are being accommodated to wages which must contribute to their own unemployment," and added, with seeming sadness, "This . . . is the unhappy position of the merchant seamen." He made no reference to his earlier attack on foreign-born seamen.

Taylor is no brasscheck reporter. A man of independent means, the wealth he gained in the corn-products and pulp-paper industries has helped him vault into the fields of journalism and radio. Poor's Register of Directors and Executives for 1944 lists him, as in previous years, as president and director of the Package Advertising Company; member of the advisory board of the Chemical Bank and Trust Company; director and member of the executive committee of the Anemostat Corporation of America; and director of the Skol Company, Inc.

These impressive links with high finance and big business must have slipped Taylor's mind in August, 1943, for he permitted The Reader's Digest to state he had "retired from business to devote himself to his economic and political investigations." That same blurb appears on the jacket of Taylor's "Men in Motion," from which he extracted choice excerpts for his article in The Digest published under the revealing title, "Boondoggling on a Global Basis." It was this article which first won him international notoriety. Leading publications in America were quick to condemn the sensational charges he leveled at our conduct of the war and our "excessive internationalism." The merit of that condemnation was proved by Berlin, which reproduced the article with a laudatory introduction in Signal, the Nazi propaganda organ.

In that article Taylor termed the Four Freedoms "sheer political buncombe" and, like a Delphic oracle, proclaimed: "Eighty percent of the colonials of the world could not, or would not, use freedom to maintain freedom. Eighty percent of the world's people simply are not ready for what we are talking about." Reprints of the article were made available by The Digest, by Taylor's office on Park Avenue and by an agency of the government of India. Taylor's early charges are still circulating and have gone largely unanswered. The New Republic herewith reviews them, with the official answers we have obtained in Washington.

1. "*American Boondogglers [in Labrador] . . . paid such high wages and so much for furs that . . . the willingness of the Eskimos to work . . . disappeared. . . . Serious dissatisfaction and unrest spread in Labrador. Then the Boondogglers turned to local Newfoundland authorities to put the Eskimos in their places.*" Canadian and Newfoundland authorities deny that American activities have caused any "dissatisfaction and unrest" among the Eskimos in Labrador. Newfoundland officials have heard of no complaints on this score. All fur purchasing in Labrador, incidentally, is done by the Hudson Bay Company.

2. "*There is . . . hodgepodge duplication of federal offices abroad. They conduct negotiations independently of our ambassadors or ministers. They pay cash to local politicians. . . . If their ideas run counter to the policy of our State Department . . . that is just too bad.*" State Department officials—and officials of every

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agency with a foreign office—declare there is a reasonable working harmony abroad. Inter-agency duplications which inevitably occurred earlier in the war, have been largely ironed out. State Department officials know of no instances of local bribery and would be interested to have Mr. Taylor produce one.

3. "[*Our*] *program in Bolivia . . . has so much politics . . . that it is doubtful whether Bolivia's tin will not stay in Bolivia.*" Our FEA-CIAA Development Program has been immensely popular with the Bolivians. American tin imports are limited because Simon Patino, who owns Bolivia's best mines, is under contract to ship his ores to England. However, Mauricio Hochschild, another South American tin magnate, is now in this country to negotiate a new contract with the FEA.

4. "*We do not get more coffee . . . because no one in the BEW* [*now the FEA*] *has had gumption enough to authorize lifting the quota.*" The FEA has never had anything to do with coffee quotas, which are handled by the International Coffee Board and the War Shipping Board. WSA officials have been unable to discover any instances where ships returned empty from South America when they might have been filled with coffee.

5. "*Meat abounds in Australia . . . but . . .* [*American*] *ships come back empty when they could bring Australian meat.*" Australian authorities, in coöperation with the Combined Food Board, restrict meat exports from Australia because it is badly needed by American and British soldiers there. Department of Agriculture officials say that, in relation to this need, meat is far from "abundant" in Australia.

6. "*This is not the time to pay an American* [*electrician*] *$1,000 a month . . . at Accra . . .* [*or*] *to build immense bases . . . with an understanding that only union labor be sent abroad.*" Although The New Republic has been unable to check with official sources on wages at Accra, seaport capital of the British Gold Coast, a former employee of a large Middle East contracting firm has informed PM that electricians' wages at Accra average between $350 and $450 a month. A spokesman for the AFL emphatically denies that union membership is prerequisite to foreign assignments.

Taylor resents any insinuation that he is anti-labor and offers the quick rejoinder that his father, a Midwest mine owner, had signed the first collective-bargaining agreement in America. But labor, particularly the CIO, has its own opinion. Both in the Scripps-Howard press and over the Blue Network he gives aid and comfort to the Republican Party campaign by his blistering assaults upon Sidney Hillman and the CIO Political Action Committee which he heads. With monotonous regularity, which doubtless will continue until the elections are over, he denounces Hillman as the virtual ruler of America. On one occasion he warned that "PAC leaders already have more cash in their treasury than the Republican and Democratic Parties combined." The fact of the matter is that the PAC is strapped for funds, having frozen until after the November elections $300,000 of some $700,000 raised nationally, in order to avoid any violation of the Smith-Connally Act. Further facts which somehow have escaped Taylor's attention are that reports required by law to be filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives reveal total collections by the Republican National Committee of $413,318.14 since January 1; $425,720.31 collected since March 10 by the United Republican Finance Committee for Metropolitan New York; $67,733.25 collected by the New Jersey Republican Finance Committee in the last three months. Taylor prefers to assassinate Mr. Hillman's character and point accusingly at his foreign birth. One example will suffice: "Mr. Hillman . . . pyramided a Lithuanian darning needle into a multimillion-dollar union tsarship."

Taylor also gets around as a lecturer. Before the Economics Club of New York last January he charged that General de Gaulle was "a bad leader" for the Fighting French. If he has now changed his opinion, he is keeping it to himself. Last March, speaking at a book meeting sponsored by The New York Times, he asserted that "the muddle of national socialist philosophy in our own government has caused even Americans to doubt themselves and their value as free individuals." He made the prediction at the Bond Club of New York in October, 1943, that the Soviet Union would denude the Reich economy by transporting German factories and perhaps 2,000,000 German workers to the USSR.

Last December Taylor cabled a series of stories from Spain which were front-paged in The New York World-Telegram. They were as neat a job of whitewashing as has ever been attempted of Generalissimo Franco and his Fascist regime. PM and the Catholic Basque Delegation in the United States promptly denounced those articles. Taylor, for example, in his December 15 "exclusive" dispatch, quoted at length Franco's President of the Cortes to the effect that there are a total of only 30,000 prisoners in Spanish jails. Two weeks later The New York Times put the figure at 270,719, based on a report of the Spanish Director General of Prisons.

In 1941, when Taylor was overseas for the North American Newspaper Alliance, he spent a week with the then President of Finland, Risto Ryti. The Times headlined his dispatch, "Ryti Denies Links of Finns to Nazis." Taylor himself, writing in Life Magazine on January 12, 1942, said of Ryti: "No man could have displayed greater confidence in the power of the truth and none could have arrived at the truth more openly than he did with me." Yet the Finnish people have ousted Ryti because of his close association with the Nazis. As for dictator Antonio Salazar of Portugal, Taylor described him in his book, "Time Runs Out,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

published in 1942, as "unquestionably one of the ablest men in the world today." He reiterated that view in a glowing portrait of Salazar he penned for the August 19, 1944, issue of The Saturday Evening Post.

Taylor has amply manifested his complete and intransigent opposition to world progress and human freedom. To him, as he expressed it, "the word 'free' . . . carries certain insincerities, because it is so meaningless."

POTOMACUS

The Negro Press and Politics

HOW THE NEGRO VOTE goes in November may conceivably decide the election, and the Negro press will be a big factor in determining how that vote goes. Of 18 influential Negro papers in the country, 15 are published in 10 strategic states which have a total of 224 electoral votes. In these states, the Negro vote is sufficiently large to influence the outcome of an election. In eight—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania—the potential Negro vote in 1944 is larger than the margin of victory in the 1940 campaign.

The Negro press holds a powerful position among its four million readers: no other single factor does more to mold the opinions of America's 13 million colored citizens. For this reason, its editorial attitude is being closely watched by campaign strategists.

Knowing this, and realizing that the combination of circumstances existing today may never again be duplicated, most Negro papers are playing their cards close to the chest. They are aware that between now and November 7, they and the Negro people are in the auctioneer's position—calling for the highest bidder. And this time, unlike what has sometimes happened in the past, the "taking bid" will not be in terms of money.

The Chicago Defender, one of the Big Three Negro papers, expressed this editorial view on July 15:

> Yes, the Negro vote in 1944 is for sale—but for a high price. No more will a measly dollar or two-dollar bill on a street corner buy our ballots. Today we can be bought only with postwar jobs and ballot rights. Today we cast our ballots for the men and the party that will give us the genuine political emancipation that we won only in part in 1865. Today we strike for full freedom.

Negroes have had a long experience of the futility and impotence which go with being "in the bag." For nearly 70 years they adhered to the belief of Frederick Douglass, an ex-slave who rose to leadership and fame in a ceaseless fight for betterment of the Negro's plight, that "the Republican Party is the ship, all else is sea." They saw themselves gradually eased out of first-class passage into second class, then to steerage, and finally dumped into the sea as Republican money-eyed interests more and more courted the bourbons of the South for economic, if not political, reasons.

Once in the sea, the Negroes clung to the Roosevelt raft. They did so in '32, '36 and '40. But despite remarkable gains, mostly in the first eight years, Negroes began to see the entrenched Southern bloc of the party being increasingly appeased on racial issues.

A factor which contributed to the growing dissatisfaction of Negro papers with the Democratic Party was the defeat of Henry A. Wallace as vice-presidential nominee. Even papers committed to the support of the party expressed displeasure over his rejection.

The Michigan Chronicle, published in Detroit, said in its issue of July 29:

> The tragic rejection of Henry Wallace to appease the reactionary elements within the Democratic Party comes at a time when acts of appeasement are most revolting. . . . It will be difficult for them to explain away the conviction of many millions of Americans today that in repudiating Henry Wallace, the Democratic Party repudiated the liberal platform upon which he staked his political life. Unless the Democratic high command immediately begins to repair the damage done at Chicago in selling out Henry Wallace, this convention may well become the turning point in the political fortunes of the Democratic Party. . . .

An analysis of the editorials and a poll of 18 of the more influential Negro papers, with circulations ranging from 20,000 to more than 250,000 weekly, indicate many of them have not decided yet on which side they will cast their weight. A few of them are committed; others show leanings toward one man or the other. Before November 7, however, practically every one of these papers will have taken a definite stand. For whom that will be, depends on the interim developments and on how those developments are interpreted.

It is fairly safe to say that of these 18 papers, 9 will be for Roosevelt, 7 for Dewey, 1 will be independent, and 1 will remain in doubt, as follows:

For Roosevelt: Chicago Bee, Chicago Defender, Michigan Chronicle, St. Louis Argus, People's Voice (N. Y.), Oklahoma Black Dispatch, Atlanta Daily World, Houston Informer, and Norfolk Journal and Guide.

For Dewey: Kansas City Call, St. Louis American, Afro-American (Baltimore), Amsterdam Star-News (New York), Cleveland Call-Post, Philadelphia Tribune, and Pittsburgh Courier.

Independent: Louisville Defender.

In doubt: Indianapolis Recorder.

Taken from this line-up, in seven important and politically close or doubtful states the Negro papers' support for the presidential candidates would be as follows: Illinois: Roosevelt 2, Dewey 0; Kentucky: Roosevelt 0, Dewey 0; Michigan: Roosevelt 1, Dewey 0; Missouri: Roosevelt 1, Dewey 2; New York: Roosevelt 1, Dewey 1; Ohio: Roosevelt 0, Dewey 1; Pennsylvania: Roosevelt 0, Dewey 2.

HARRY MC ALPIN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Dewey: Young Man with a Load of Mischief

THOMAS E. DEWEY is showing himself to be a dangerous man. That is the chief impression this correspondent gets of Round II of last week's oratorical exchange. President Roosevelt showed his remarkable virtuosity in changing from the satire and raillery of his Teamsters' address to the equally effective tone of high dignity and earnest appeal. He also showed by his words the Democratic worry lest a small vote spell party disaster. But it was Dewey's Saturday night speech that brought this reporter up gasping. This man Dewey is really worth watching.

Back on May 23, 1939, I heard Adolphe Berle testify before the old TNEC regarding his abstruse theories of "capital credit." Berle warned that the country might some day face danger if the private-credit system failed to work, and urged reform. I remember, after writing my story, commenting on the testimony to a correspondent of The Chicago Tribune in the Senate press gallery and then forgetting it. About ten days later I got a clipping from The Milwaukee Journal, quoting alleged utterances of Berle from The Tribune, and denouncing him as a dangerous radical. What The Tribune had done, it instantly appeared, was to leave out all Mr. Berle's warnings and, by a process of "selective quotation," make him appear to be advocating the very government ownership of industry which he was predicting might follow if his warnings went unheeded. Knowing that Mr. Berle would be curious, I took the Journal editorial in to him; he dictated an answer to it in my presence. The Journal subsequently retracted its charge, and that was the end of it—until it bobbed up again in Governor Dewey's speech Saturday night!

But what kind of man is this Dewey who can make such amazing charges? He began by asserting on the flimsy basis of one non-policy-making official, General Hershey (a Republican), that the administration is planning not to demobilize soldiers because it fears unemployment, thereby sowing suspicion in the armed forces. He followed this with the monstrous charge that MacArthur had been deprived of supplies for political purposes. Next came the bald accusation that Roosevelt had pardoned Browder "to lead his election campaign," ignoring the fact that Willkie had urged the pardon two years before, along with law-school deans, educators, ministers and a former American Bar Association head who felt the four-year sentence grotesquely heavy for the offense involved. Now comes the Berle charge. The audacity of these accusations and the contempt they seem to imply for democratic intelligence is the disturbing thing. It is this reporter's reluctant conclusion that Mr. Dewey is a dangerous young man.

Three great educational institutions in America today are the schools, the movies and the radio. The latter two have been captured by commercialism. That is perhaps why the American doughboy makes such a bad contrast to the British Tommy when you come to discuss public problems; why you can't buy intelligent books at the stationery store and have to be content with comics or movie magazines.

But now comes a new chance to rescue radio. Technical war development, the arrival of FM—high-fidelity Frequency Modulation—means that a great number of new channels are available for distribution by the Federal Communications Commission after the war. A preliminary curtain-raiser is going on in Washington now, as the FCC holds public hearings prior to an international radio conference next spring. After the international channels are rearranged comes the great domestic battle for control of the new channels, title to which is reserved to the public.

What America needs is one chain, federally owned and run by an independent agency like the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a yardstick of the air, a radio TVA. Most observers fear, however, the chance for that is past.

Yet here comes a big new distribution of radio public domain—a modernized throwing open of Western lands for pioneers. Will the grubstakers be independent settlers or Eastern moneybags? Radio carries entrance into 32 million homes; it is commercialized to the point where gross time sales of all broadcasters last year were $307 million. The impotent policeman for this gigantic power is the FCC; its feeble effort to protect the public has made it the subject of constant attack, in which the very argument of "free speech" is twisted against it. Among other things it will have 40 juicy FM channels for postwar distribution, which alone will provide dozens of additional stations on the standard broadcasting band. It is trying to reserve five of them for so-called "educational" use.

Of 900 standard broadcasting stations, two-thirds are affiliated with four chains utilizing 95 percent of the nighttime broadcasting of the entire country, and 144 advertisers provide 97 percent of the networks' business. That's the reason the housewife gets "sponsored soap opera" and why the National Association of Broadcasters' code is rigged against coöperatives, trade unions and so-called "controversy." The NAB code, for example, rules that anything about labor is controversial *per se*, and hence time-purchase on the air is banned. A symphony orchestra becomes "controversial" if a union sponsors it. If Ford sponsors a symphony, with W. J. Cameron's peculiar economic views in the middle of it, it is quite all right.

America has pretty well sold out her public domain of the air; no, not sold out, given it away: encouraged the pill-makers to raise billboards in its radio national parks; that is why we get D-day by courtesy of a laxative and the deaths on Tarawa sponsored by a hair tonic. But the battle isn't over and the FCC is hoping for public support.

Random Notes.—Observers here take an anti-Franco rising seriously if the United States and, particularly, Britain don't interfere, and think it might even include a revolution against Portugal's dictator Salazar: one recent, well informed estimate is that 75 percent of the Spaniards oppose Franco. . . . A man we know tried to send a congratulatory Western Union telegram, but the girl wouldn't take it—explained the government has banned such messages to save wire time; our friend substituted "felicitations" for "congratulations" and it passed with flying colors.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Notes on Newsreels

ALONG WITH an unrestricted, more imaginative use of movie technique in making newsreels, and an emphasis on improving the quality of individual events rather than the quantity, American newsreels could stand an overhauling of their ideas of what makes suitable newsreel material. It seems to me that the newsreels, as the journalist in movies, should be concerned with everything that happens around us, rather than restricting themselves, as they do now, to the more spectacular occurrences in human affairs. To get into the lens of an American newsreel camera an event must be as momentous as the first baseball game of the season, the debut of the newest model of anything, or a President's speech. The concern of the newsreels should be to exhibit material that shows to some substantial degree what we are like and what we have done. For this aim, the record of Frank Sinatra's or Harry James's latest performance at New York's Paramount Theatre, and the reaction of the audience to it, becomes a bona-fide newsreel event, since the event has so much importance to the people and indicates what so many of them are like; a camera account of a day spent on a wartime railroad coach is important newsreel material, since it tells us and a future age much more about ourselves than any train wreck, which is the only kind of train news that makes the newsreels now. The straight reporting of any activity on any American Main Street or a detailed examination of that street's buildings should become the most important and exciting kind of newsreel event.

The newsreel producers are too apt to show only the limited, obvious aspects of even their most traditional subject matter. The typical newsreel examination of someone's speech confines itself almost wholly to the speaker, missing all of the effect of the speech as it registers on the audience and all of the character of the event that is defined by the character of the audience. The only part of the event that is shown is the speech part; there is no account of how the people looked as they got ready for the speech, nor is there a post-speech phase—only the speaker's carefully purposeful, man-to-man stare straight into the lens.

The main concern exhibited on newsreel subject matter is less to give you an understanding of the events or the people in them than to give some kind of visual proof that the incident actually occurred and that Fox-Movietone, Paramount or Hearst covered it; the announcer unsuccessfully attempts to fill in with other aspects of the event to make it an understandable, rounded and exciting story. The endlessly repeated way of showing an Allied capture of an enemy-held town follows up a few last-minute examples of the fighting for the town with scenes of the Allies entering and being celebrated, hugged and kissed by the people. All the newsreel audience gets is what is already taken for granted—that the event happened and that everybody there was happy it did. By going behind this obvious center of such an event and doing a straight report about the condition of the people and the town at the moment of its capture, examining homes inside and out, and as much of the life at its most natural as could be got, newsreels would have the most important material about people in war. Where it has approximated this attitude—in scenes coming some time after such a capture, where people are being fed and cheered by the Allies, and in the trying of traitors—it has accomplished its best releases, giving something of the character of the people as it was affected by the Nazis and war: to an audience this is much more interesting (not to mention more important) than the usual spectacular, circus-like aspect of an event such as a fire, where the fearsome, decorative movements of the flames are the main thing shown.

Almost at once, of course, the newsreel people would, with their aim of showing a more abundant and down-to-earth view of human activity, run into all kinds of legal difficulties, the kind of difficulty suggested by the signs you see in various places prohibiting the use of cameras inside them. I can think of all kinds of reasons for shooting the activity inside of an average night club, but I can think of as many reasons why a night-club owner would kick at the idea. The legal point would finally have to be made as to just what the newsreels can look at, and I can't see that their view should be more restricted than that of a daily newspaper. As it stands now, the newsreels' fear of what they can look at is as great as it could possibly be, and their vision almost as limited. MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

. . . Should Thomas Dewey win this high post his executive training, clear thinking, and his known conservatism, make it certain that his administration not only will continue on the right, and away from socialistic experimentation, but will even strengthen the constructive tide which has already set in. There is another bulwark to be relied upon, and that is that the new Congress will be more conservative than the recent previous ones. All these indicators point in a favorable direction, which may explain the lack of uncertainty and a large measure of freedom from fear in this election by business and industry. —*From an editorial in The Financial World.*

With Rumania and Bulgaria out of the Axis orbit, Italy a co-belligerent, France liberated and other lands being one by one wrested from the Nazis, the question at the moment uppermost in American collectors' minds is how soon Washington will permit philatelists to acquire the many European stamps which have been released in enemy and enemy-occupied countries during the war years. —*From The New York Times.*

Just Folks

For lunch, the Deweys retired to the Hutt's five-room, white-framed cottage where [Mrs. Dewey's] parents have lived for 30 years. It was a quiet family reunion, with Oklahoma State troopers and New York detectives standing in the front yard. —*From The San Francisco Chronicle.*

Total-War Department

FIVE JAP ADMIRALS KILLED
BY UNITED PRESS

—*A headline in The Belvidere (Ill.) Republican.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. —THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

What the Negro Needs

SIR: Miss Lillian Smith's article "Addressed to White Liberals" [The New Republic, September 18] raises an important point. It is clear that she regards segregation as the essence of the "white" problem. In my opinion, Miss Smith's position might be strengthened if, in place of saying, "A first step is to acknowledge that man is not an economic or political unit," she had said *man is an economic and political unit, but the unity of man in these respects depends upon a recognition of the social unity of the race with which the principle of segregation is antithetical and irreconcilable.* I still believe with the authors of the Declaration of Independence that certain truths are self-evident, among which are the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that to these must be added "a loaf of bread, a ballot and a book in everyone's hand."

This is to say that segregation means not only the emotional, human and other forms of humiliation which Miss Smith mentions, but includes also economic, political and educational privations, and unless the Negro be invested with the right to work and eat bread, to vote and hold office as well as to fight and to pay taxes, and with the right of enjoying educational and cultural advantages in all forms, he will derive little pleasure from the rights to travel, to sleep in hotels, to eat in restaurants, to build houses and to engage in social intercourse where he pleases. . . .

Abolish segregation? Absolutely and without reservation. In so doing, make it plain that it includes all forms of discrimination, disfranchisement and impairment of economic, political, social and, if possible, emotional rights. . . . The abolition of segregation must carry with it all the positive material and social benefits that are implied therein. . . .

OTIS DURANT DUNCAN

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Okla.

Compulsory Military Training

SIR: While the major powers plan together at Dumbarton Oaks for the future peace of the world the incongruous rumble of the compulsory-military-training bandwagon is audible on America's Main Street.

Why the rush? Is it fair not to allow the 11,000,000 young Americans now experiencing the "benefits" of military training to give their testimony? And is the only alternative to unpreparedness a program of compulsory military training?

The objectives of the proponents of the military program are reasonably acceptable, but how unrealistic they are in believing that a single year of army regimen, following 18 years of habit fixation by the individuals involved, will produce in those individuals such results as physical fitness, discipline, technical skill, leadership and good citizenship.

How naïve it is to believe that physical fitness, neglected for 18 years, can be achieved in a single year of physical culture, army style, much of it at the hands of untrained non-coms. As for discipline, what chance is there that an agency whose own internal discipline is completely autocratic and characterized by quick, unquestioning obedience to orders from above can develop in young America a democratic type of conduct characterized by rational behavior without external compulsion?

As to leadership, ask GI Joe how best to get along in the army and don't be alarmed if, without hesitation, he says, "Keep your eyes and ears open, your trap shut, and don't volunteer for a damned thing." He'll be quoting a lieutenant's advice to a group of recruits. Does this sound conducive to the development of leadership?

Yes, you'll get a little technical training from a year of the army program, but it will be wrapped in copious amounts of "gold-bricking," a natural product of compulsory military training. And don't expect too much good citizenship from tearing young John Q. Public from the stabilizing ties of home, community and friends and placing him in barracks where indecency, bad manners, profanity, sexual laxity, drinking and racial and religious intolerance are unrestrained.

Might it not be more realistic (and cheaper) to kill two birds with one stone, by giving a mandate, along with support and authority to carry it out, to American educators to strengthen the program of public education in such ways as to provide for the desired results (by adding a "national service year" if need be)? Why place our confidence now in a program new to the American scene—compulsory military training in peacetime?

Now is the time for someone to put a sprag in one of the wheels of the military-training bandwagon and, while it is slowed, run the American model, an improved program of education, back into view. It promises to be a safer conveyance for the rough roads ahead.

Carlisle, Pa. A DOUBTING GI THOMAS

From The New Republic Mail Bag

A commander in the navy writes to us concerning the economic plight he shares with "the entire middle class, the teachers, minor executives, the small savers," the purchasing power of whose small incomes and savings has been reduced one-third by inflation. "Circumstances beyond my control," our correspondent writes, "have forced me to make an entirely disproportionate financial contribution to the war." This, he says, is in contrast to the worker in war industries, the financier and the small trader, who are profiting from the war. "How much better that we should all have less," he says, "than that we should bid up prices and thus destroy all . . . the careful saving . . . designed to perpetuate the useful role of the middle class, the very bulwark of liberalism and democracy."

The formation of an association to work for the independence of Puerto Rico, in the belief that no advance toward economic and political reform on the island can be made without self-government, has been announced by a group of liberals including Oswald Garrison Villard, J. Henry Carpenter, A. Philip Randolph, J. Holmes Smith and Richard J. Walsh. Inquiries concerning the new organization should be addressed to Mr. Walsh, 40 East Forty-ninth Street, New York City 17.

Paul L. Lawyer, of Rockford, Illinois, writes warning of the strain soon to be put on our inadequate unemployment-compensation system by the impending release of an estimated four million workers from war industries. Not only has Congress refused to pass much needed reforms in the unemployment-compensation legislation, he says, but the administration of state systems has been handicapped by reduction of funds.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

The France That Died

THERE have been a good many books on one aspect or another of the French defeat in these last four years, a few of them good, a few of them bad, the great bulk of them indifferent. Some have been cold analyses of the military events; some, passionate diatribes against the politicians, or the generals, or the journalists the authors hold responsible for the outcome; some have been attempts by politicians to justify themselves; a few (a very few) have sought to go beneath the surface events and examine the basic causes.

But it has remained for the enormously learned, tirelessly industrious and eternally wise correspondent of The London Daily Telegraph, The Baltimore Sun and the North American Newspaper Alliance to examine the whole tragedy from virtually every angle, and to write a book[1] about it which is at once a masterpiece of political analysis, a competent critique of the military campaign, an impassioned defense of the French people and of the democracy in which they put their faith, an intimate account of the private lives and inner weaknesses of their leaders, and a bold and noble declaration of confidence in the future of France.

Pertinax's book (a translation, with an added epilogue and some new matter, *passim*, of his "Fossoyeurs," published last year) is a history of France from the outbreak of the war to the return of Laval, in April, 1942, a history arranged around the characters of the principal actors in the tragedy: Gamelin, the general who had prepared to refight the war of 1914-18, and who was utterly incapable of adapting himself to the surprises of the Blitzkrieg of 1939-40; Daladier, the Premier who tried but failed to unite his people or kindle in them the warlike spirit without which no nation can hope to win; Reynaud, his successor, who took office too late to stem the tide and save his country from occupation by the enemy, and who yielded too easily to those who preferred making an armistice to continuing the fight from Africa and with the fleet; Pétain, the aged Marshal whom servile vanity, a deep distrust of democracy and an itch to command induced to become the Hindenburg of France; and Laval, the bitter parvenu, scheming grafter and convinced fascist, who engineered the Vichy counter-revolution and presided over its disintegration into naked, brutal police action against his fellow countrymen, in the interest of the Germans.

Around the characters of these five men Pertinax has woven his story, drawing again and again on his voluminous diaries (which go back at least as far as 1914), his innumerable conversations with several of the principals and hundreds of the supernumeraries, the confidences of generals and ambassadors, the gossip of the capital and his seemingly inexhaustible knowledge of the documents. Though very long (about 200,000 words), enormously detailed and sometimes very repetitious, the book is never dull. It is enlivened by many brilliant flashes of Gallic wit. Thus Weygand's "shrinking military efficiency was fairly well symbolized by the tiny sword which French academicians wear in public ceremonies . . ." and he and Pétain were taken into the Cabinet at the last minute as "precautionary umbrellas for Reynaud's use." By the time Robert Murphy began to cultivate him, in North Africa, Weygand "had turned into a stunted little old man. The smart cavalry lieutenant had utterly disappeared. He looked like a retired jockey."

At the ceremony at which Pétain received the Marshal's baton, Weygand is revealed to have whispered to another officer, "And to think that we have shoved him to such an eminence by untiringly kicking his buttocks!" Charles Maurras, the leader of the royalist Action Française, reminds Pertinax of St. Simeon Stylites: "He never comes down off his column except to get bricks, year by year, to build it higher and a little further from reality." Laval is shown to have been scheming to make Pétain dictator of France as early as 1935; he "was always gambling on this white-haired Cid's last foray and, ever since the autumn of 1939, had been busily at work adjusting the wires which kept the warrior upright in his saddle." As for Darlan, he was "the model [now being] reproduced in the present mass output of turncoats." But the ultimate insult is reserved for Pétain. "In the Teutonic sense of the word," Pertinax solemnly writes, "*marshal* originally meant a slave in charge of the horses. Pétain has dragged down the marshalship to its original significance."

Yet, despite these and many other expressions of scorn and indignation, the book as a whole is very fair—surprisingly fair, all things considered. I shall give but one example. In their grief and bewilderment at the sudden disappearance of their country from the company of the Great Powers, many Frenchmen found the explanation in treachery. France cannot have been defeated in fair battle, they cried. She must have been betrayed.

Not so Pertinax.

"I do not believe that treachery, in the strict meaning of the word, played an important part in our defeat," he says. "But petty treachery, which is bred of neglect and apathy, of leaders great and small who are forgetful of their trust, or rather believe that they can discharge it by the fulfilment of routine duties, that kind of treachery was often to be met."

This is, in fact, the epitome of his indictment of the leaders of the Republic. (His judgment of Pétain and Laval, of course, is of quite another order.)

If Pertinax's book has any faults more serious than excessive length and a tendency to repeat itself, one of them is the emphasis it puts on the role of a relatively few individuals in determining the fate of a great nation. It would be grossly unfair to compare "The Gravediggers" to the "Chronique de l'Oeil de Boeuf," that peep-show into the intimate side of the life of Louis XIV and his court; and yet there is a great deal of "Oeil de Boeuf" in it—too

[1] The Gravediggers of France: Gamelin, Daladier, Reynaud, Pétain and Laval: Military Defeat, Armistice, Counter-Revolution, by Pertinax. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 612 pages. $6.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much, perhaps, in proportion to the rest. Pertinax is at his best in recounting confidential exchanges between ministers and ambassadors, describing the contents of the small notes left on the desk of a premier by his mistress, reconstructing, on the basis of later leaks, the exact language of a debate in a closed Cabinet session. He is also bubbling over with revelations (among many others worthy of mention but for lack of space, is the astonishing assertion that in the summer of 1941 and later Winston Churchill seriously considered the idea of establishing a constitutional monarchy in France!). He is less competent to deal with the basic causes of the decline and fall of the Third Republic. (His attempt to explain the economic causes, for instance, is wholly inadequate.)

Rather more dangerous, in my opinion, is his underlying political philosophy. With all his wisdom and catholicity, he is a Rightist, and tends to be a chauvinist. Though he places the blame for French unpreparedness squarely on the shoulders of the High Command, where it certainly belongs, he also suggests that the reforms of the Popular Front, and particularly the forty-hour week, had a part to play in it. Yet if, as he points out, the High Command failed to ask for adequate appropriations, and did not make full use of those it received, it is difficult to see how this can have been true; should the workers have insisted on working overtime, without pay, to produce weapons the generals claimed were unnecessary?

Nor does Pertinax have (nor has he ever had) any faith in the League of Nations and the idea of collective security. Events, it must be admitted, seem to have proved him right. But his prejudice in favor of national armaments and power alliances prevents him from examining objectively the motives of men like Aristide Briand and Albert Thomas. To him they are little more than irresponsible dreamers. (He is much less hostile to Léon Blum.)

By the same token, he is very hard on the Weimar Republic, which he calls a "counterfeit of democracy . . . play-acting, a sham, a preparation for revenge."

In general, despite his profound knowledge and his almost Olympian view, he partakes in some measure of all the conflicting emotions most of us have undergone since the fall of France; he is profoundly uneasy about the future, deeply nostalgic for the past (Clemenceau, I need hardly add, is his hero) and highly indignant at those who have (or seem to him to have) disturbed the calm current of historic development by their inept muddling. Unfortunately, in the maze of his details, he tends to lose sight of the revolutionary nature of the world crisis through which all nations are passing.

There is still another of Pertinax's basic attitudes which I feel obliged to mention, as a kind of warning to his readers, and that is his attitude toward the Soviet Union. He feels free to criticize England and the United States for the parts they played in contributing to his country's downfall; it is his right to do so, a right he sometimes exercises in rather scathing terms. But in all the 600 pages of his book there is not one word of criticism of Russia, not a single reproach. This can hardly be due to any deep love of Russian social institutions; it must be due, rather, to a profound respect for power and a desire to avoid muddying the waters of Franco-Russian relations (which he rightly regards as one of the principal keys to the French defeat). In this sense Pertinax is a conservative leaning over backwards.

But, as James Thurber once remarked, you might as well fall flat on your face as lean over too far backwards. The nature of the Communist regime in Russia, its record of ruthless repression and its avowed revolutionary purposes, constituted very real obstacles in any program to make it a full ally, and it was not only conservatives who sometimes hesitated; liberals and socialists too had their moments of uneasiness. Pertinax berates the governments of Britain and France in corrosive terms for their failure to reach an agreement with Russia in the spring and summer of 1939. But in the negotiations Russia demanded the right to establish naval and air bases in the Baltic States, and the Baltic States let it be known that they would fight any nation which attempted to set up such bases. Would Britain and France have been morally justified in giving Russia a "free hand" in the circumstances? What would have been the effect on the struggle between isolationists and internationalists in the United States if they had? What would have been the effect on other small nations in Europe? These are questions which Pertinax conveniently ignores. Yet they remain profoundly disturbing ones even today, when they are again before us. They come close to the heart of the world tragedy.

But, to some extent at least, all this is quibbling. For Pertinax does not pretend to have written more than an "essay," and his title makes no pretension that the book is a rounded history. Yet it is the most complete history of France in the war years we have had, or are likely to have until many more documents have become available and many more memoirs have been written, published and digested. It is a truly monumental work, one which is destined to replace almost everything else that has so far been written on the subject. Hereafter only historians and specialists will have to read the others; everyone else can safely content himself with Pertinax. VARIAN FRY

Four Portraits of Roosevelt

What Manner of Man? by Noel Busch. New York: Harper and Brothers. 189 pages. $2.
Presidential Agent, by Upton Sinclair. New York: The Viking Press. 672 pages. $3.
Mr. Roosevelt, by Compton Mackenzie. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 256 pages. $3.75.
Rendezvous with Destiny, by J. B. S. Hardman. New York: The Dryden Press. 367 pages. $3.

A WELL KNOWN JOURNALIST once made an exhaustive study of Roosevelt biographies in an effort to uncover the intricate machinery that makes the President tick. After reading them all, he regretfully concluded that Mr. Roosevelt's personality remained as baffling as ever. The President had been described in various ways by different writers but, like Proteus, he had eluded them all in the end.

Noel Busch is the latest writer to attempt the unenviable task of clearing up the Roosevelt enigma. He begins with a simpler formula than was used by any of his predecessors. According to Busch, who writes biographies for Life, all human character, including Roosevelt's, "is as easy to solve as the problem of two times two. . . . It is a simple matter

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of research and common sense." Just to prove that he means it, Busch uses only 189 pages to give you a psychological evaluation of Roosevelt's motives; a brief critical juxtaposition of Roosevelt's personality with that of America itself; a cursory summary of Roosevelt's past record as President; and an analysis of his present position.

Busch's frequent excursions into "parlor psychoanalysis" form the weakest part of his book. Pointing out Roosevelt's close affection for his mother, and the wide disparity in age between Franklin and his father, Busch concludes that the United States electorate has provided a necessary mother-substitute for Roosevelt. This evidently explains why the President insists on seeking a third and fourth term. We are told that Roosevelt treats his advisers (whom Busch describes at one point as "a swarm of loud-mouthed, loutish juveniles, neurotic, namby-pamby fixers, freak, five-cent philosophers, woozy, double-talk idea-men . . . little leftist Caesars) with the arbitrary whims of a child who was once spoiled by tutors. Therefore, "he [does] not really understand [their] reasoning, or think that he should try to do so." Mr. Busch reinforces his conclusions with such astute psychological observations as: "One reason Roosevelt liked his mother so much was that she liked him so much."

There is little evidence in these amateur generalizations that Busch has much understanding of the tremendous social events which have occurred during the last ten years. He leads you into a political wonderland where great national crises happen simply because of the President's own inner impulses. So, Roosevelt's battle to reorganize the Supreme Court was undertaken because the President is really just a "spoiled brat" who feels thwarted by legal authority. Had Busch penetrated a little deeper into historical cause and effect, he might have discovered that the Court's conservative Justices had actually challenged the entire New Deal by torpedoing some of its most vital legislation. Roosevelt was not just being "impudent and silly" in fighting to save the Railroad Retirement Act, the New York State minimum-wage law, the Guffey-Snyder bill and similar measures; he was fighting to preserve the entire social gains of his previous administration.

Busch's casual summary of Roosevelt's administrations omits most of the major events which happened during them. He does, however, level one very serious criticism against Roosevelt: that he failed to prepare this country for war during his first term. A fitting answer to this charge is provided by Compton Mackenzie, who asserts that Roosevelt had his hands full promoting recovery at home, and that not even the President's super-salesmanship could have argued the American people into war at that early period.

Some of Busch's criticisms of Roosevelt are perfectly valid; my objections to those I have cited are not cut on political bias. They are merely intended to point out the dangers of Busch's oversimplified biographical methods.

It will not surprise Upton Sinclair's fans that his picture of the President demonstrates a much better conception of history than that of Noel Busch. "Presidential Agent" is at least partially concerned with the constant political and social pressures which have conditioned the President's actions. Sinclair's new book takes up where the previous Lanny Budd cycle left off. As an unofficial agent of President Roosevelt, Lanny Budd gets mixed up in the Spanish civil war, the Cagoulard plot to betray France to Germany, the Munich sell-out, a flock of séances, some Hairbreadth Harry escapes from the Nazis, and even a little rug-chewing with Adolf Hitler. Sinclair's new book is as good as his previous ones on the imaginative level, but his plot often bogs down with little other than world events to sustain it. President Roosevelt, like all the other characters in the novel, only appears in bas-relief. Sinclair is more interested in people as symbols than as human beings, and this leaves his image of Roosevelt as one-sided in its own way, as that of Noel Busch.

Where is the definitive Roosevelt portrait? Not in Compton Mackenzie's book, which for the most part is made up of rather florid and uncritical praise of the President. Roosevelt's growth as a statesman can be traced most accurately from his own words, which J. B. S. Hardman has boiled down into a single volume. But these shed little light on the complex personality behind them. After reading these four books, you will probably conclude that Mr. Roosevelt has slipped through his biographers' hands once again, leaving the job of measuring his full stature up to the future.

ALLAN SPALDING

Who Has Rescued Whom

Behold the Jew, by Ada Jackson. New York: The Macmillan Company. 24 pages. $1.

ABUNDANCE, for Christopher Smart, was not hampered by fear of surfeit, one suspects, when he was writing "A Song to David," and the all but defiantly reiterative prolonging of the poem seems natural because the thinking was feeling. "Behold the Jew"—a recent prize poem in England—is also a poem of praise, a fiery testament of love that leaves one with a sense of rapture.

Naming some of "the mighty" who have been earth's best ornament, the author exclaims, "Oh world, . . . Behold/how many and how bright the Jews!" Nor is the heroic Jew exceptional, she says. Judas Maccabaeus and the soldier "in khaki ere his turn," "donating blood," then life itself, are alike. It is indeed self-evident that Jews have a money sense. "When they break a thing they pay"; and where they owe nothing, they give. Jews who give enormously are, Mrs. Jackson perceives, not unlike the small shopkeepers she has known, and the tailor who "threw the buttons in," three expensive mohair buttons; the club member who "dug down deep" for a certain caretaker and for victims he had never seen. "No strings trailed from such givings. He/gave fully, freely, silently." Recalling "Anna Marks" whom every charm enshrined, Mrs. Jackson says, "I will assay and prove the Jew/as I weigh other nations —by/the hearts I know, the hearts I knew."

Then what of "the slaughter camps; the piteous vans/ where souls must choke their way to God." And that particular tone of voice for the Jew, used by "my kind," my freedom-loving Gentile kind; what of it? "If I keep silence all these things/are done of me and in my name," Ada Jackson says. Even now—("While you read they die, they died").

As poetry, the crippling death of Anna Marks perhaps has an effect of over-tragic imbalance, and one would prefer a neater wording for the sentence, "God hath with/ lesser tools than we/worked miracles/for all to see." But

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what neatness of articulation as part of an instinctive music, in the allusion to *baum* and *stein* and *brunnen*—"names that are rock and tree and well—/of judges and of counsellors/and captains over Israel." How eloquent reiteration can be, as an element of compactness: "Praise God for death," . . . and "all the loveliness you knew/befouled and lost and trodden down,/for that you were a Jew, a Jew—" There is expert allusiveness throughout the poem, especially where the simile of the mustard-seed heightens David's towering slenderness above the prostrate body of Goliath:

> There was a day
> when warriors paled
> and armies shook,
> and a young lad
> stooped down and took
> five little pebbles
> from the brook—

Some do not believe that all nations are of one blood, and shrink from the un-fascist minister who says the star of David is not the enemy of the star of Bethlehem, that "we cannot have love in our hearts for one star and hatred in our hearts for the other star." And "while you read they die, they died"; they, by way of whom all our moral advantages have come. If we yet rescue them—those who are alive to be rescued—we still are in debt and need to ask ourselves who would have rescued whom.

MARIANNE MOORE

CHAMBER MUSIC
SIX SAT. EVE. CONCERTS: Oct. 28, Nov. 11, Jan. 6, Feb. 3, Mar. 17, Apr. 7
Washington Irving H. S., 16th Street & Irving Place
$2.20 Incl. Tax
ROTH QUARTET — JOSEPH SZIGETI SONATAS
CHERNIAVSKY DUO — BRITT TRIO
BUDAPEST QUARTET — AMERICAN WOODWIND
Mail Orders to PEOPLE'S SYMPHONY CONCERTS, 32 Union Sq. STu. 9-1391

MICHAEL TODD presents
BOBBY CLARK in
MEXICAN HAYRIDE
by HERBERT & DOROTHY FIELDS • Staged by HASSARD SHORT
SONGS BY COLE PORTER
WINTER GARDEN, B'way & 50th St. Mats. Wed. & Sat.

CRITICS' PRIZE PLAY — THE THEATRE GUILD presents (in association with Jack H. Skirball)
JACOBOWSKY and the COLONEL
The FRANZ WERFEL - S. N. BEHRMAN COMEDY — Staged by ELIA KAZAN
LOUIS CALHERN — OSCAR ANNABELLA — KARL WEISS
MARTIN BECK THEATRE — 45th W. of 8th Ave.
Evgs., 8:30. Mats. Thurs. & Sat., 2:30

INVENTS BIRTH CONTROL

Slide rule, important in the determination of woman's periods of sterility and fertility. The birth control slide rule, invented by Dr. Francis W. Baxter, consulting psychologist, shows these periods at a glance and its use offers a dependable, ethical and healthful method of controlling conception. Leading ecclesiastical and medical authorities endorse it. Stop using harmful, unreliable and costly contraceptives. Order the birth control slide rule now. Simple to use; details fully explained. As a limited offer, send only $2.00 (cash or money order) to DR. FRANCIS W. BAXTER, Socioanalytic Research League, One Sixteen E. 11th Street, New York City 3, N. Y. If over twenty-one, send at once. © 1944

Africa Speaks—for Itself

Without Bitterness, by A. A. Nwafor Orizu. New York: Creative Age Press, Inc. 395 pages. $3.

ONE OF the greatest difficulties in assessing the role of colonial peoples in the postwar world is to get their own point of view regarding their present situation and their hopes for the future. This is not only because they are often regarded as so "retarded" in culture that they are not capable of holding a point of view; it is also because, actually, there are so few statements of their position to which we can refer. Because of this, if for no other reason, Mr. Orizu's book is a notable contribution. For it is one of those rare statements by a native of a colonial possession which not only presents the native point of view, but presents it vigorously, judiciously and without rancor, and with full comprehension of its setting in world history and politics.

Mr. Orizu has equipped himself carefully to do this work. A member of the ruling house of one of the Ibo groups of eastern Nigeria, his early education in African mission schools was followed by study at Lincoln University; he then went to Ohio State, where his principal field was government, and finally pursued graduate study at Columbia University in government and public law.

In his thinking he has been deeply influenced by two philosophies. The first is that of Spengler, whose cyclical theory of civilization he uses to explain his conviction that Africa, the toy of European expansion, is experiencing a rebirth that is bringing a new political epoch which must eventuate in independence. The second influence is that of Nnamdi Azikiwe, an Ibo publicist and editor, whose vigorous drive for African autonomy has made him the leader of those who, in Mr. Orizu's phrase, are workers for "African irredentism," an important element in the approach toward imperialism termed "zikism" in this book.

It is impossible to discuss the program set forth by the author in the space of an ordinary review, but it can be summarized as a demand for the independence of Nigeria within the next ten or fifteen years as a prelude to the future freeing of other West African, and eventually of all African, dependencies from foreign control. One might wish for a less frequent confusion of "Africa" with "Nigeria" in statement, and of "Nigeria" with "Ibo" in the development of the argument, and that more consideration had been given other imperialisms than the British. Yet despite this, the points are cogently and soberly put; and the evaluation of imperialism, as concerns its effects in the fields of politics, economics, culture and religion, provides much food for thought.

What is most important about the program Mr. Orizu sets forth is that it builds on the African past, and does not seek to make of Nigeria the kind of pseudo-American political entity that we find in Liberia, where imposed, half-comprehended institutions and theories of government have been responsible for so many of the internal and external difficulties that have dogged the country. Mr. Orizu is proud of his past, certain that his culture has the adaptability and resources to reach and hold the place he believes it must take, and confident that it will in the future achieve that place. His presentation of West African philosophy and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the West African view of democracy is unique, and his style, salted with the typically African citations of proverbs to make his points, demonstrates how good an African he is.

For most persons, his book will reveal a new approach to the colonial problem. Certainly it should be read by all who are concerned with long-range questions of establishing and maintaining world peace. For such questions involve the aspirations of colonial peoples to a far greater extent than those not conversant with the colonial problem can realize.

MELVILLE J. HERSKOVITS

A Reader's List

PROBING OUR PREJUDICES, by Hortense Powdermaker (Harpers, $1). "Prejudice means jumping to a conclusion before considering the facts." This small book attempts to help high-school students "become aware of their prejudices, to understand the nature, origin and effect of prejudices, and to suggest activities which can help reduce them." The Nazis came to power because they succeeded in reviving fears and prejudices of the past. The country's unity is menaced by the spread of misconceptions among the American youth. Professor Powdermaker briefly tells the case histories of many individuals who, on account of the bias—racial, religious or otherwise—of their surroundings are hampered severely in their pursuit of happiness. In an appendix, "Suggested Activities," Helen Frances Storen urges the students to measure by tests their own prejudices, to find out what causes them and, through special programs —more or less along the lines of the famous Springfield (Massachusetts) Plan—to eliminate preconceived opinions about their fellow citizens.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY, by Donald Dunham (John Day, $2). With the exception of a few human-interest stories that have nothing to do with our diplomatic service, and of two on British imperialist practices in Aden that remind us of Nazis in action, this book is distinguished by its dullness and its extremely limited knowledge and vision. The author served as vice-consul in our Foreign Service for eight years in Berlin, Hong Kong, Athens and Aden. The first two chapters tell something of the machinery of our Foreign Service and might inspire an unimaginative boy to follow in the author's footsteps. Now and then there is a flash of intelligent observation about the world at large. In Aden, Dunham learned of Arab quislings of the British, and talked with RAF pilots who had been bombing Arabian villages beyond British territory because the Arabs had to be "kept in line" and taught to respect "white supremacy." He was also asked by the resident British to defeat the local Arab tennis champion because tennis is a British game and "the mark of a gentleman, and who ever heard of an Arab being a gentleman." Dunham did so. The author praises Robert D. Murphy—the basis of his praise is an official report of the British vice-consul in Algiers. Fortunately Mr. Dunham has left the diplomatic service to learn something about the United States and, we hope, the world.

A HISTORY OF THE WAR, IN MAPS, IN PICTOGRAPHS, IN WORDS, by Rudolf Modley (The Infantry Journal and Penguin Books, 25 cents). This book is an attempt to tell the history of the war in maps, charts and diagrams, with a minimum of accompanying text. Necessarily, only the broadest outline of events lends itself to this treatment. Yet there is doubtless a large public which wants only a simple and elementary treatment, and for its purposes this inexpensive little volume should serve admirably.

MEN OF SCIENCE IN AMERICA, by Bernard Jaffe (Simon and Schuster, $3.75). Mr. Jaffe has told the history of American science through the personalities of nineteen distinguished scientists, scattered through the years from the earliest day to the present, including four men who are still living. In each case he not only gives the biography of the individual but a rapid summary of his branch of science down to his time. The result, particularly in the later chapters, is both a series of lively personal sketches and a useful, rapid picture of what is going on in such fields as general physics, genetics, astronomy and atomic research.

BLACK MAIL, by Henry Hoke (Reader's Book Service, Inc., $1). Written for popular consumption, this pamphlet summarizes the more sensational aspects of the connection between the Nazi propaganda machine and the native fascist movement in this country, with emphasis on the support they received from reaction-

FIRST AID TO BUSY PEOPLE

EXECUTIVES • TEACHERS
WRITERS • SPEAKERS
STUDENTS • CLERGYMEN
LAWYERS • LIBRARIANS
PUBLIC OFFICIALS, ETC.

To keep you well-informed and up-to-date, you need

FACTS-ON-FILE
World News Digest

Would you like to condense 100 hours of weekly reading into 30 minutes, without missing a single important fact or event? Do you wish to have every major subject and news event at your finger-tips—condensed, sorted, filed and indexed for ready reference? *FACTS ON FILE* does it for you by means of a *weekly 8-page digest* that covers world news in capsule form, stripped of verbiage, opinion, and comment.

FACTS ON FILE saves you hours of reading time, improves your fund of knowledge, gives you all the news of the world including World War II, National and Foreign Affairs, Latin America, Finance, Business, Arts, Science, Education, Religion, Sports, Obituaries, etc., in handy reference form. Authoritative, concise, easy to read.

With *FACTS ON FILE* you can discard your clippings, notes, and stacks of magazines. Acclaimed a "MIRACLE OF CONDENSATION" *FACTS ON FILE* is endorsed by prominent leaders in all walks of life as invaluable for quickly locating facts, checking dates, figures, speeches, and names. Busy executives, speakers, governments, schools, libraries, business firms subscribe to *FACTS ON FILE as the ONLY publication of its kind in America.* Each weekly Digest comes to you with a Cumulative Index that keeps *FACTS ON FILE* up-to-date automatically.

SPECIAL OFFER

TRY FACTS ON FILE for 5 weeks for only $1.00 (value $2.50). Regular subscribers at $25.00 a year receive a handsome loose-leaf DE LUXE BUCKRAM BINDER *FREE OF CHARGE* (Size 9½ x 11½ inches). Holds a year's supply of Digests and Indexes.

Send the coupon below with only $1.00 for special 5-weeks' trial, which includes latest Quarterly Index FREE OF CHARGE.

FACTS-ON-FILE
"THE NEWS OF THE WORLD IN CAPSULE FORM"
516 5TH Ave., New York 18, N. Y.

☐ I enclose $1.00 for Special 5-weeks' trial service to FACTS ON FILE, which entitles me to latest 22-page Quarterly Index FREE.
R.

Name.....

Address.....

.....
NR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

27 Titles by CLARENCE DARROW

Neatly printed in 18 thrilling sections, 1,157 pages, 300,000 words—almost two pounds for only $1, plus 25c for packing, handling and carriage.

Clarence Darrow denounced people's pet notions and made them like it. Here are booklets that will startle you into new lines of thought. A handy pocket library of booklets of liberal viewpoint. Here are the Darrow titles:

Is Life Worth Living? Debate vs. Frederick Starr.
Is the Human Race Getting Anywhere? Debate vs. Frederick Starr.
Facing Life Fearlessly. Courageous Philosophy of Life.
Lord's Day Alliance. Debunking "Blue" Sundays.
Insects and Men: Instinct and Reason.
How Voltaire Fooled Priest and King.
The Skeleton in the Closet. Famous Lecture.
Essay on Walt Whitman.
Essay on John P. Altgeld.
Realism in Literature and Art.
Essay on Robert Burns.
Essay on Geo. Burman Foster.
Some Paragraphs Addressed to Socialists.
Is Capital Punishment Justified? Debate vs. Judge Talley.
Is Prohibition Right? Debate vs. John Haynes Holmes.
The Ordeal of Prohibition.
The Edwardses and the Jukeses. Question of Heredity.
Are We Machines? Debate vs. Dr. Will Durant.
Can the Individual Control His Conduct? Debate vs. Prof. Smith.
Dry-Law Pro and Con. Debate vs. Wayne B. Wheeler.
Do Human Beings Have Free Will? Debate vs. Prof. Foster.
Resist Not Evil. Discussion of Non-resistance.
An Eye for an Eye. Complete Novel.
Plea in Defense of Loeb and Leopold, the Boy Murderers.
Darrow vs. Bryan in the Famous Scopes Anti-Evolution Case.
The Defense of a Negro. Famous Dr. Sweet Case in Detroit.
A Day With Clarence Darrow.

This set of Darrow booklets at only $1, plus 25c for carriage, etc., is a real bargain. Ask for WORKS OF DARROW and mail order to

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS
Box D-201 Girard, Kansas

PAMPHLET

WHAT GOES ON

An appraisal of current trends
48 pages **Price 25¢**

This pamphlet has been referred to by eminent scholars in economics and politics as "mature" and "a masterpiece of realism, wit and satire."

However, you don't have to be a professor to understand what it says.

Jay J. M. Scandrett
71 Franklin Street • Englewood, N. J.

LANGUAGES

PHONOGRAPH RECORD COURSES. All Makes. Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st St., New York City 17, N. Y.

AUTHORS — ATTENTION

WE ARE CONSIDERING adding to our list of publications acceptable manuscripts of prose and poetry. THE MOSHER PRESS, 85 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

ary Senators and Representatives who permitted the free and frequent use of their franking privilege by Nazis and native fascists alike. Most of the material presented is already familiar from articles in the liberal press and the books of Carlson, Kahn, Wechsler and Lavine. Belonging strictly to the Walter Winchell school of anti-fascism, "Black Mail," like its predecessors, fails to explain either the origins of native fascism or the reasons for its strength in our democracy.

SOME OF MY BEST FRIENDS ARE SOLDIERS, by Margaret Halsey (Simon and Schuster, $2.50). Miss Halsey's new book is a series of letters written by Gretchen, recently divorced from an alcoholic, to her brother Jeff, a young scientist, now in the army. Gretchen manages to sandwich in long letters between keeping house for her father (a war worker) and being a hostess at the USO canteen, where she discovers the race problem, and discusses it with Jeff as if it were a new phenomenon that had descended upon America full-bloom and overnight. This "kind of novel," as the publishers call it, is strictly for those who want to be amused and have their serious discussions served with wisecracks, from 4-5 p. m.

Crime and Punishment

DEATH AT THE DEPOT, by D. G. Hastings (Harpers, $2). Crawford's Bend, Vermont, near the Canadian border, is in a tizzy over the arrival of the mysterious Mr. Simpson, who takes a large house on the edge of town, brings his secretary and servants, and keeps himself very much to himself. One of the guests at Mrs. Barnard's (Board-Rooms) starts the rumor that he is a spy, which, strangely enough, turns out to be the case. While no baffler, this is recommended for its accurate and highly amusing rendering of assorted Vermont types.

THE DARK TUNNEL, by Kenneth Millar (Dodd, Mead, $2). Robert Branch, college professor, and his best friend, Alec Judd, are worried over leaks from the files of the Detroit War Board. While they are investigating, Judd dies. Suicide, the cops say, but Branch knows Alec was murdered by German agents. To prove it, he and the FBI have to outsmart as slick a crew of Nazis as ever moved in on the USA. A humdinger—and well written to boot.

THE GLASS MASK, by Lenore Glen Offord (Duell, Sloan and Pearce, $2.50). Todd McKinnon never dreamed up anything so fantastic for his pulp-magazine crime stories as the set-up he found in Adeline Tillsit's fabulous Victorian house in Valleyville, California. Adeline had died four years before—at 82—but the townspeople were still saying she'd been poisoned by her nephew and heir, Gilbert Peabody. Nella Peabody persuades Todd to try to clear her husband's name—Gilbert is off fighting in the South Pacific—and this, with the help of his fiancée and her small daughter, Todd does. A good novel of atmosphere and character as well as a very satisfactory detective story, by the author of "The Skeleton Key."

E. H.

Contributors

Maurice Edelman is a war correspondent for the English magazine, Picture Post, and a contributor to The New Statesman and Nation.

James Loeb Jr. is the executive secretary of the Union for Democratic Action.

Oscar Gass, Director of Research for Robert R. Nathan, Consulting Economist for the WPB, was formerly economist in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Potomacus is an office pseudonym.

Harry McAlpin is the only Negro newspaper reporter accredited to attend the White House press conferences of the President, where he represents The Atlanta Daily World and the Negro Newspaper Publishers' Association. In June the Capital Press Club voted him the best reporter among Washington correspondents of the Negro press during the year 1943.

Varian Fry, a contributing editor of the New Republic, spent more than a year in Vichy France, representing the Emergency Rescue Committee, and had many contacts with the French underground movement. He is now executive secretary of the American Labor Conference on International Affairs.

Allan Spalding, a graduate of Columbia University, is at present doing economic-research work.

Marianne Moore has contributed verse and criticism to The Nation, The Kenyon Review, Life and Letters, Poetry and The New Republic. Her new volume of verse, "Nevertheless," has just been published by Macmillan.

Melville J. Herskovits is a professor of Anthropology at Northwestern University whose contact with colonial life has been anthropological expeditions to West Africa and the West Indies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED